

THE DISCIPLES DIVINITY HOUSE
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



HERBERT LOCKWOOD WILLETT
LIBRARY



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
CARLI: Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

The Editor's Notes

The Baltimore Conference Again

Next Steps WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN

The Protestant Episcopal Church and Christian
Reunion BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, JR.

What People and Papers are Saying About Unity

False Steps Toward Unity (No. 1)—The Baltimore Conference on Unity—As
Another Episcopalian Sees It—Dr. Opie Explains—The Baltimore Conference
on Unity (No. 2)—Doorways to Unity—The Tendency to Ape Rome—Inter-
denominational Communion Service in Ohio

Opinions on the Findings of the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference

W. Douglas Mackenzie—Milton G. Evans—Donald J. Cowling—L. C. Clark—
Frederick D. Kershner—Curtis E. Coe—Paul D. Moody—E. E. Rall—A. Roger
Kratz—Allan Hoben—W. O. Mendenhall—Boothe C. Davis—George B. Cutten
—Walter Dill Scott—James R. Angell—Edwin E. Jacobs—Henry B. Wash-
burn—R. W. Swetland—Shailer Mathews—Albert C. Knudson—Ozora S. Davis
—P. I. Lipsey—G. D. Edwards—Hamilton Holt—Walter F. Dexter—Frederick
Carl Eiselen—Thomas Wearing—F. H. Groom—James A. Kelso—W. H. P.
Faunce—James G. K. McClure—Wm. Wirt King—Silas Evans—John T. Ullom
—Charles E. Creitz—Fred G. Boughton—Warren H. Denison—Thomas W.
Currie—Edward S. Parsons—C. A. Mock—A. D. Harmon—G. W. Nash—Ray-
mond Binford—Emory W. Hunt—Jas. E. Clarke—Edward P. Dennett—
Charles R. Erdman—Mark E. Penney—A. G. Voigt—J. Sheatsley—Guy E.
Snavey—William M. Horn—Harlan L. Feeman—J. H. Morgan—Chas. J.
Smith—Ralph E. Peck—Wm. F. Quillian—C. W. Locher—Arthur E. Main—
S. K. Mosiman—W. P. Minton—A. F. Gray—O. F. Jordan—W. G. Clippinger

Book Reviews

Faith and Order—Lausanne 1927—Lausanne: The Will to Understand—Think-
ing Toward Christian Unity—Miss Mayo's Mother India, A Rejoinder—A Son
of Mother India Answers—Our Fathers Faith and Ours—The Story of Phil-
osophy

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Inc.

230 N. FULTON AVE., BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

AGENTS:

Fleming H. Revell Company, New York

Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai

A Statement

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the Unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are free to all indications of Christian Unity and Ventures of Faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all others who accept Jesus as Lord and Savior—are parts of the Church of Christ and that their Equality before God is the paramount issue of modern times.

Such a journal must, necessarily, be unofficial in its attempt to be an Interpreter of the mind of the churches and in furnishing a Forum for better understanding and cordial appreciation between the divided, and sometimes far isolated, communions of Christendom. It, thereby, seeks to contribute something to clear the way to the Altar of Reconciliation.

It does not hold itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors, except in a very general way as to their character and general attitude; but it invites to its pages such contributions of thought as will, on one hand, help in the removal of misunderstandings, and, on the other, create an atmosphere where our differences may be frankly faced and freely discussed in Christian Fellowship.

All contributors are allowed the same freedom in the expression of their thoughts, as the Editor exercises for himself. He does not anticipate that others will always approve his thoughts, any more than he presumes to assume responsibility for the thoughts of others; but every writer is responsible for what appears above his own name. We are to be free to think and equally free to let think, until, in corporate thinking and corporate praying, we find the Road to Brotherhood.

Consequently, this journal is not only not the organ of any party in Christendom; but, likewise, it is not the exponent of any theory of Christian Unity. It follows the reality in personal experience of spiritual growth in Christ—growing up in Him and toward other Christians as we find the Truth, which shall free us from suspicion, prejudice, pride, and unlove. Then we shall be able to interpret Christ in those terms which He expressed in His own words,—“By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have Love one to another.”

CONTENTS

JULY, 1928

VOL. XVIII.

No. 1.

<i>THE EDITOR'S NOTES</i>	3
<i>THE BALTIMORE CONFERENCE AGAIN</i>	10
<i>NEXT STEPS</i>	15
<i>WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN</i>	
<i>THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN REUNION</i>	28
<i>BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, JR.</i>	
<i>WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY</i>	37
<i>OPINIONS ON THE FINDINGS OF THE BALTI- MORE CHRISTIAN UNITY CONFERENCE</i>	64
<i>BOOK REVIEWS</i>	92

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

230 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES:—THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is open to contributions from all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all other Christians who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour. It is entirely immaterial whether these contributions agree or disagree with the Editor's position, or the position of any contributor. We are seeking to bring together those who differ, for unless we frankly face our differences, and think them through, we shall never agree. THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY welcomes to its Forum all Ministers of Reconciliation.

PRICE:—The price of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, published in January, April, July, and October, is seventy-five cents a single copy, or two dollars and fifty cents a year, in the United States and all parts of the world. A local church of any communion contributing annually \$5.00 or more to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY EXTENSION FUND will be entitled to receive two copies of THE QUARTERLY free for one year—one copy going to the minister and the other copy to some designated person or institution.

*Entered as second-class matter October 18th, 1923, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.,
under the Act of Congress of March 3rd, 1879.*

The Christian Union Quarterly

EDITOR

PETER AINSLIE, D.D., Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FREDERICK LYNCH, D.D., Educational Secretary Church Peace Union, New York, and BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, JR., D.D., Rector St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, Richmond, Va.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

- | | |
|---|---|
| DR. HAMILCAR ALIVISATOS,
Athens, Greece. | PROF. RUFUS M. JONES,
Haverford, Pa. |
| BISHOP CHARLES P. ANDERSON,
Chicago, Ill. | REV. SAMUEL McCOMB, D.D.,
Dresden, Germany. |
| REV. NEHEMIAH BOYNTON, D.D.,
New York, N.Y. | BISHOP FRANCIS J. McCONNELL,
Pittsburgh, Pa. |
| BISHOP CHARLES H. BRENT,
Buffalo, N.Y. | BISHOP WILLIAM F. McDOWELL,
Washington, D.C. |
| DEAN CHARLES R. BROWN,
New Haven, Conn. | THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER,
Manchester, England. |
| PROF. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN,
New York, N.Y. | REV. WILLIAM P. MERRILL, D.D.,
New York, N.Y. |
| REV. RAYMOND CALKINS, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass. | DR. WILFRED MONOD,
Paris, France. |
| BISHOP JAMES CANNON, JR.,
Washington, D.C. | DR. C. C. MORRISON,
Chicago, Ill. |
| PROF. DR. J. EUGENE CHOISY,
Geneva, Switzerland. | DR. JOHN R. MOTT,
New York, N.Y. |
| REV. S. D. CHOWN, D.D.,
Toronto, Canada. | BISHOP HARALD OSTENFELD,
Copenhagen, Denmark. |
| DR. J. A. CRAMER,
Utrecht, Holland. | BISHOP EDWARD L. PARSONS,
San Francisco, Calif. |
| PROF. DR. ADOLF DEISSMANN,
Berlin, Germany. | PROF. ARTHUR S. PEAKE,
Manchester, England. |
| REV. A. W. FORTUNE, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky. | PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS,
Lancaster, Pa. |
| DEAN H. E. W. FOSBROKE,
New York, N.Y. | PRINCIPAL W. B. SELBIE,
Oxford, England. |
| DEAN W. E. GARRISON,
Chicago, Ill. | PASTOR DR. FRIEDRICH SIEGMUND-
SCHULTZE,
Berlin, Germany. |
| PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE,
London, England. | DR. ROBERT E. SPEER,
New York, N.Y. |
| MOST REV. METROPOLITAN GERMANOS,
Thyatira, Asia Minor. | THE ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA,
Upsala, Sweden. |
| PRESIDENT W. A. HARPER,
Elon College, N. C. | DR. HENRY VAN DYKE,
Princeton, N. J. |
| DR. HENRY T. HODGKIN,
Shanghai, China. | REV. JOSEPH A. VANCE, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich. |
| REV. FINIS S. IDLEMAN, D.D.,
New York, N.Y. | BISHOP BOYD VINCENT,
Cincinnati, Ohio. |
| DEAN W. R. INGE,
London, England. | BISHOP LUTHER B. WILSON,
New York, N.Y. |

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

JULY, 1928

THE EDITOR'S NOTES

The passing of Dr. J. H. Shakespeare of London removes another member of the editorial council of *The Christian Union Quarterly*. We met him first in 1914 and then observed that he was an ardent friend of Christian unity. His book, *The Church at the Cross Roads*, which made concessions to episcopacy, was criticized by some of his brethren of the Free Churches of England, but this book revealed a passion for the unity of Christendom that made it historic. Although active in the work of the Baptists, Dr. Shakespeare's chief contribution was to the cause of Christian unity.

With this issue Rev. Beverley D. Tucker, Jr., D.D., the rector of St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, Richmond, Va., becomes one of the associate editors of *The Christian Union Quarterly*. Dr. Tucker's bold and Christian stand relative to receiving persons in good standing in other communions into St. Paul's Church without confirmation puts him with those who are making Christian unity more possible. He does not abandon confirmation in the practice of St. Paul's Church, but simply recognizes that there are Christians in other communions and, when any of those Christians desire to become members of St. Paul's Church, he receives them without imposing upon them the Protestant Episcopal practice of confirmation. Among Baptists and Disciples a similar custom is being established regarding baptism by immersion, their churches not abandoning baptism by that form, but receiving into their membership persons whose baptism has been by other forms. All these are contributions toward a better understanding in the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ.

In June a Christian unity conference was held in San Francisco in which Baptists, Congregationalists, Disciples,

Episcopalians, Lutherans, Methodists, and Presbyterians took part. They discussed the Stockholm Conference of 1925, the Lausanne Conference of 1927, and the Baltimore Conference of 1928, and also the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, with particular emphasis on our "Next Step Toward Christian Unity." It opened with celebrating the Lord's Supper in Grace Cathedral, in which all the communions represented took part. This was a normal conference on Christian unity—partaking of the Lord's Supper together and then spending a day in conference on how to find the way to unity. Would that there were a hundred such conferences throughout the United States this year and next. The Christian Unity League has announced that it will hold its next conference in Kansas City, January 16 and 17, 1929. Other cities may be included, but the necessity of a united Christendom must constantly be kept before the Church by these free conferences where all may come and share in the discussions. Unity cannot come unless the whole Church moves together.

In an article in *The Living Church* Most Rev. John Gardner Murray, presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, raises the question as to "*Where Lausanne Failed.*" Such a caption for an article from Bishop Murray awakens surprise, when it is remembered that his church largely sponsored the Lausanne Conference. Had he raised the question as to *where* Nicea failed, when bishops boxed each others' jaws, tore each others' garments in their fist fights, and so kicked one of their number that he died a few days after, perhaps it might have been proper, although it is like digging up some of the escapades of Herod or Constantine, which might as well be left undisturbed. Church history will do itself credit if it gives only a paragraph of a few lines to Nicea.

But Lausanne marked a turn in the road in the history of understanding among Christians, demonstrating that, although widely separated theologically, the Church had arrived at a place in history when its representatives, coming from all parts of the world, could sit together as Christians and discuss their

differences frankly without giving any offense whatsoever. It was a triumph of the Spirit of God. "That it has happened," as said the Anglican bishop of Manchester, "was an achievement in itself." That the interest increased as the conference advanced, that members of the conference came to a better understanding among themselves, and that a new spirit of Christian brotherhood was released for the good of all, were achievements decidedly worth while.

It was a conference on faith and order and, therefore, not a conference on international peace, as Bishop Murray desired. It may be true as Lord Burleigh once said: "They that differ in the service of God can never agree in the service of their country." That may account to some extent for the difference among Christians as to the meaning of world peace. For our part war is wholesale murder and Christians have no moral right to take part in it. But Bishop Murray would hardly go so far. Perhaps there would have been as widely dissenting opinions among the members of the Lausanne Conference on world peace as on faith and order. We have got to do some growing.

While much general talk is going on about Christian unity in the United States, the Congregationalists and Christians are getting down to business. Plans are now under way that seem to make it almost certain that the union of these two communions will be consummated at an early date under the temporary name of "Congregational-Christian Church." They are altogether worthy leaders in this cause. They have similar histories in their contention for Christian liberty, Congregationalists being the older, however, reaching back into English history, while the Christians are an American product with a history of little more than a hundred years. Numerically the Congregationalists are nearly a million and the Christians are over one hundred thousand. It is most appropriate and happy that these two communions are taking the leadership in the United States in blazing the way to a united Church. In the next issue of *The Christian Union Quarterly* we shall have an

interpretation from both communions as to this important step they are planning to take.

In New York State the Disciples and Congregationalists took a definite step toward understanding and coöperation in the recent state convention of the two communions. They held a joint convention in Syracuse and appointed commissions to confer relative to closer coöperation. It may not be so difficult for these two communions to come into closer coöperation in New York State, where the Disciples have such a leader as Dr. Finis Idleman and others, but it is hardly likely that these two communions as a whole, although much alike, could unite at this time. While there are many churches among the Disciples practicing open membership and the number is increasing, nevertheless that number is not sufficiently large now to assure an early union of the Disciples with any other communions, but it will come later, and perhaps earlier than many would calculate.

The move on the part of the Methodists and Presbyterians is to be heartily commended. The Presbyterians would doubtless be slower than the Methodists, as was the case in Canada, but in both communions there are many who are ardent Christian unity advocates. All of the communions in the United States are becoming sensitive to this plague of denominationalism and no one need be surprised at an advanced step on the part of the various denominations for closer affiliation, if not for unity. The reasonableness of a united Christendom is finding a permanent place in the thought and convictions both of the leaders and members of all Christian communions.

A Southern Baptist minister writes regarding the Lausanne Conference, denying its standing in church history because Catholics and Southern Baptists were not a part of it. Since both of these groups were courteously invited, he should find fault with them in being unwilling to sit with their brethren, instead of finding fault with the conference. At the same time, that ably edited journal, *The Baptist*, Chicago, as appears on

another page, finds fault with the Baltimore Conference of the Christian Unity League, affirming that it "had no church standing whatsoever," and the editor regards the celebration of the Lord's Supper on that occasion and Dr. Morrison's sermon as illustrations of "the tendency to ape Rome." We are sorry that neither of these conferences was pleasing to our Baptist brethren, one being composed of officially appointed delegates, with Catholics and Southern Baptists declining, and the other composed of all Christians who wanted to come, including Catholics and Southern Baptists in its membership. In both conferences, however, there were Baptists who made fine contributions. The celebration of the Lord's Supper in the Baltimore Conference was not used "to lampoon" anyone, as *The Baptist* seems to think, any more than Jesus sought "to lampoon" the apostles when the Supper was first celebrated. Nothing could have been more appropriate after discussing our love for Him and fellowship among ourselves than to celebrate the Lord's Supper, recalling that He said: "Do this in remembrance of me." Of course such a service did dissent from party-exclusiveness in celebrating the Supper; but that was neither here nor there. The conference sought to do with the present day disciples of our Lord as He did with the disciples of His time. That was sufficient, whether it dissented from party customs or not, whether the tendency was toward Rome or toward the Baptists or toward neither. There was no lampooning of the multitude of Christians to get them to the Lord's Supper on that occasion. No Baptist need have come to it unless he wanted to. Those who were invited to assist did it graciously and a large number of Baptists were in the audience voluntarily and partook of the Supper as "a simple memorial symbol," which *The Baptist* seems to deny in this instance. Dr. Morrison's sermon was a most satisfying interpretation of the Supper. There are elements of equality of all Christians before God both in baptism and the Lord's Supper, which speak in accents of Christian democracy. Our Quaker friends were active in the conference. One presided at the first part of the service when Dr. Morrison delivered his sermon, preceding the

celebration of the Lord's Supper. Although not using the visible elements, their communion was as real as that of those who did use them. They have a right to their choice of interpretation as others have a right to their choice, but neither group has a right to disfellowship another group whose interpretation differs from theirs. It is for the fellowship of all Christians in equality before God for which we plead, and to many of us baptism, irrespective of its mode, and the Lord's Supper, irrespective of the theories surrounding it, speak for this equality.

The International Missionary Conference in Jerusalem has marked another epoch in the evolution and expansion of Christian fellowship throughout the world. Dr. John R. Mott, writing from the Mount of Olives, Jerusalem, sends this thrilling and heartening letter :

Dear Mr. Ainslie:

You will be interested to know that the enlarged meeting of the International Missionary Council, over which I have been presiding here during the past fifteen days, has surpassed all expectations. You will not be surprised that such was the case, as you turn the pages of the Who's Who of the gathering and note how this gathering blended the leadership of the Christian forces related to the world mission of Christianity in some fifty different countries.

Although there had been questioning in some quarters as to the wisdom of holding the meeting in Jerusalem, such doubts have been completely dispelled. Meeting in this birthplace of Christianity and in a city likewise sacred to the other two monotheistic religions, Judaism and Mohammedanism, deeply moving associations helped to furnish a wonderful spiritual atmosphere. The fact that the meeting synchronized with Holy Week served to deepen the impression.

If I were to attempt to characterize the Jerusalem meeting, I would say without hesitation that it was the most courageous religious assembly which I have ever attended in nearly forty years of participation in religious conferences. When in the history of the Church have workers faced such a combination of difficult and baffling situations — social, economic, racial, international, religious — or been called upon to meet so many stern and exacting challenges? This they did without flinching or evasion. There was a note of reality running through all the discussions and official actions. Things were faced precisely as they are, and were called by their right names. While the members never descended from the high altitude of

idealism and far-ranging vision, they kept their feet on the ground. The addresses, debates, and decisions were forward-looking. I venture to say that ten, yes twenty, years hence men of discernment will be able to say that Jerusalem marked nothing short of the beginning of a new epoch in the evolution and expansion of the world-wide Christian movement.

This Council meeting was also most coöperative. Just as the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh in 1910 gave a great impulse to the cause of unity, so I believe that Jerusalem will advance by a generation the drawing together of Christians of different lands and races. It constituted the first meeting ever held in which the representatives of the older churches and the younger churches have met on a fifty-fifty basis; that is, in which the representatives of the churches of Europe, North America, and Australasia which send missionaries were represented in approximately the same proportion and number as the churches of Asia, Africa, and Latin America which were planted by missionaries. This becomes all the more striking when we recall that as recently as the Edinburgh gathering there were only about a score of Nationals representing these indigenous churches in mission lands among a total of over 1200 regular delegates. In some respects the most distinctive characteristic of Jerusalem might be expressed in the word sharing, by which one means that in the fellowship we experienced in Jerusalem the Christian workers of the East and West shared their visions, insight, experience, burdens, hopes, and purposes. As a result, a new atmosphere was created — an atmosphere in which we came to understand one another, to trust one another, to recognize that we are indispensable to one another, and to realize a genuine spiritual solidarity.

Time will naturally be required to estimate the full results of a gathering so unmistakably creative and dynamic. A most fortunate circumstance is the fact that the forces of the churches and missions are so organized as to make possible the realization of world-wide expansive purposes and the conservation of vital results; for, while at the time of the Edinburgh meeting there were only two countries organized for uniting the Christian forces related to world-wide missions, there are to-day twenty-six such national bodies, as well as the International Missionary Council which binds them together.

If I were to sum up in a word the outstanding contribution of this meeting on the Mount of Olives, it would be that it has afforded an authentic lead to the Christians everywhere who are interested and concerned in the world-wide establishment of Christ's Kingdom. The need of having some widely representative and authoritative body afford such a lead has for some time been apparent to all those who have reflected on the fact that we have been living in a time of so much confusion of thought, conflicting voices, and divided counsels, with resulting uncertainty, uneconomical use of resources, lack of sense of divine mission, and comparatively meager spiritual results.

Very sincerely yours,
JOHN R. MOTT.

The Baltimore Conference Again

EVERY Christian unity conference has a distinct value, whether it be the conversations at Malines, the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order, or the Baltimore Conference of the Christian Unity League. To use the words of Emerson, "They only serve as an index to show where man is now." Particularly was this illustrated in the Baltimore Conference regarding the celebration of the Lord's Supper, from which the Protestant Episcopal representative was advised by his superiors to withdraw. However rich the Baltimore Conference was in many other results, it would have been worth while if it had done nothing more than to set up this index to show where we are in Christian fellowship.

In consequence of this attitude by a communion that has been so active in Christian unity, we published in the last issue of *The Christian Union Quarterly* the liberal attitude of the Episcopalians toward the Baltimore Conference and regretted that we did not have space in that issue for the publication of the conservative attitude of that communion. Therefore space is given in this issue to the criticism by *The Living Church*, Milwaukee, and rejoinders bearing upon that criticism; also another editorial from *The Churchman*, New York, in its support of the Baltimore Conference.

Instead of the Baltimore Conference retarding Christian unity, as affirmed in editorial No. 1 of *The Living Church*, we maintained in our reply to *The Living Church* that some Anglo-Catholics and some bishops are factors in retarding Christian unity. Every man who stands in the way of Christian fellowship is retarding Christian unity, whether he be Episcopalian, Catholic, Presbyterian, Disciple, or whatnot. We are glad that *The Living Church* featured that so frequently in their editorial No. 2. The fact is here and now.

In our rejoinder to *The Living Church* we purposely made no reference to their word "contemptible," hoping that the editor of that fine journal would see how incongruous such a word is in conversations between Christians in attempting to find a way of understanding, but the hint by omission had no

effect whatever, for the editor of *The Living Church* seems to have it as a stock word, judging by his editorial No. 2. More important than any observance of the Lord's Supper is the attitude which gives expression to utterances and observances.

If all the parties in Christendom are to be loyal to their party traditions or isolations, as affirmed by *The Living Church*, Christian unity is an impossibility and the Apostle Paul's admonition to the Corinthian Christians to abandon their party traditions and isolations is entirely out of place. And instead of saying that they are carnal, Paul should have said that they are spiritual. If the Protestant Episcopal Church is to stand where it has always stood, without yielding a point on Christian fellowship, and, in turn, the Presbyterians, Lutherans, Baptists, Disciples, and the two hundred other parties in Christendom, we are face to face with the interrogation as to whether we or the first crucifiers of Jesus are the greater sinners.

It is no wonder that we have got no further in Christian unity when in the same breath that we plead for Christian unity we also plead for party loyalty. *The Living Church* is not the only organ that does that. Most denominational papers do it. The chief purpose of the denominational papers is to plead for party loyalty. But from whatever source it comes, it is the language of Ashdod. These parties are to bring to the united Church not their party loyalties, which are sectarian products, pure and simple, but their loyalty to universals, interpreted from other angles of human experience.

Take the instance cited at the Baltimore Conference. The advice against an Episcopal clergyman's participating in the celebration of the Lord's Supper was sectarian because it dealt in party loyalties rather than in universal fellowship. The editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly* belongs to a communion that practices baptism by immersion only. To be loyal to the traditions of his party he must continue to do that, therefore rebaptizing such Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and others who come for membership into his church. If they desire rebaptism, that is one thing; if he requires rebaptism, that is another thing. The first is a choice which they have a right to;

the second is a requirement which is sectarian — the same kind of sectarianism that advised against the Episcopal clergyman's taking part in the celebration of the Lord's Supper with Presbyterians and other Protestants.

To break with the traditions of the Disciples meant to break with the party standard and with many lifelong friends; but, as precious as these were, it was more precious to help to remove a barrier in one party, and thereby help to make a highway over which Christ and all His followers may walk in a common fellowship. Consequently the editor of this journal receives, without rebaptism, into the church of which he is minister those persons from other churches whose baptism has been by sprinkling or pouring. After these highways have been made in all the parties in Christendom we still have a long way to go to attain unto Christian unity. These breaks with party traditions are only one of the steps in the processes of evolution toward a united Christendom.

If Protestants accepted the priesthood, that would not bring Christian unity. Each Protestant group would have a priesthood of its own just as the Roman, Eastern Orthodox, and Anglican have now, unless all the Protestant ministers became priests either in the Roman, or Eastern Orthodox, or Anglican communion, and then we would be no further than we are now, for those communions that have their priests are no closer together than Catholics, who have, and Protestants, who have not.

If Protestants accepted the episcopacy, it would be the same thing. The Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, and Anglicans are no closer together in consequence of their episcopacies than Catholics, who have episcopacies, and Protestants, who have not.

If the whole Church accepted baptism by immersion, it would not unite Christendom. Those denominations that practice baptism by immersion are no closer together than other denominations.

If the whole Church practiced baptism by sprinkling or pouring, it would not unite Christendom. Those denominations

that practice baptism by sprinkling or pouring are no closer together than others.

If the whole Church were to accept the Nicene and Apostles' creeds, that would not unite Christendom. Those churches that have accepted the Nicene and Apostles' creeds as tests are no closer together than those that reject that kind of test.

If the whole Church came to the Lord's Supper, that would not unite Christendom. The close communion churches are no closer together than the open communion churches.

All these subjects are for conference and every effort by study and prayer and conference should be made for their adjustment. Their adjustment would *help* toward unity. But they are not the basis upon which the divided Church may unite. That basis is in the living Christ and the test is reverence and love for each other according to the standard which Christ set up. These things over which we have quarreled for ages may or may not have that merit that many of us have thought. Every one of those positions that has been an occasion for isolation is discounted because it dethrones the spirit of the Lord Jesus.

In the midst of these age-long and profitless controversies, where is Jesus Christ? He appears not to have been considered very much. He is the corner stone and not the priesthood nor episcopacy nor baptism nor the Nicene and Apostles' creeds nor the Lord's Supper. All these are incidental to Him. The whole Church needs His spirit. How can we get His spirit by any other way than by penitence and prayer?

The editor of *The Living Church* evidently regards intercommunion as solving the problem of a united Christendom, from which we dissent. After intercommunion has been established there will still be a long way to go. The editor of *The Quarterly* is spokesman for no party in Christendom. This journal is interdenominational and therefore not denominational. He does, however, contend for the equality of all Christians before God as a definite step toward unity and he feels that the sense of equality before God will be quickened as we

gather in penitence and prayer at the Lord's Supper, where His living presence may find a new interpretation of holiness in the lives of all the disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ.

We are not looking for a united Christendom modeled on that of the Roman Catholic Church; we are not looking for a united Christendom modeled on that of any one of the Protestant churches nor all Protestantism combined; we are looking, however, for a united Christendom that will gather up the best that both Catholicism and Protestantism have and go forward into a fellowship of Christians that will satisfy the world's demand that Jesus is the Christ.

We have no quarrel with any of the doctrines of the Protestant Episcopal Church any more than we have quarrels with the doctrines of the Disciples, but so long as the Disciples practice closed membership and the Episcopalians practice close communion, they are in the same class and are sectarian organizations. We insist that both of these communions should remove their barriers of exclusion and practice fellowship with the whole Church of God.

To that end we are thoroughly convinced that the barriers between the parties of Christendom must be broken down as one of the steps toward understanding, that isolations and exclusions must be abandoned as sectarian and unchristian, whether practiced by Episcopalians or Disciples. This will not come by party action until the adventurous action of many individuals awaken that party to its duty in removing barriers that hinder brotherhood.

Perhaps coming together at the Lord's Supper will help; perhaps it will not, for sectarianism is an unyielding factor. Only God knows what will bring us to see our sins of a divided Christendom. But there must be penitence in our advance toward each other. All the followers of Christ are brothers. The world is waiting for evidence that we believe this and that we are willing to demonstrate it. A multitude of protests sound at every attempt made to demonstrate it. There has never been a time when the Church so much needed the unafraid.

NEXT STEPS*

BY REV. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, D. D.

Professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York

WE have met here as a group of lovers of the Church of Jesus Christ under the stimulus of the Lausanne Conference to inquire what we can do in our own section of the Church to advance the cause which we all have at heart — the cause of the visible unity of the disciples of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

I have been asked to speak of some of the things which are immediately practicable, things that we could do now, if we would, and in order to make quite clear just what these are and why I believe they are practicable I must ask you to go back with me for a moment and to consider our question in its larger setting, as part of the movement for Christian unity as a whole.

The first thing that we have to remember about Lausanne is that it was not an isolated event but an incident in a continuous movement, a movement which began long before Lausanne itself was thought of, and which will continue long after it has become only a memory. It is important to make this point clear at the outset, for it will determine our attitude toward the varying estimates which have been made of the conference. If we think of it as an event, something complete in itself, we may conclude, and very naturally, that it was a lamentable failure. If we think of it as a step in a process, we may perceive that it did all, and more than all, that we could have hoped.

In this respect Lausanne is like Geneva. Many people tell us that the League of Nations is a failure, just as many persons tell us that Lausanne is a failure. That depends on the way

* This address was delivered by Dr. Brown at the Baltimore Conference on Christian Unity and the manuscript arrived too late to be included in the April number of *The Christian Union Quarterly* which was devoted exclusively to that conference.

that you look at it. Think of the League of Nations as a finished product, the last word in man's effort to subjugate his ancient enemy, war, and all that the most bitter critics of the League say of it is true. Think of it as those who know it best think of it, as the last step in the great experiment of finding some way to substitute reason for force, trust for suspicion, and coöperation for rivalry, and it becomes the most hopeful single thing that is happening on the face of the globe to-day.

There is more in the analogy than appears on the surface. When we penetrate to the heart of the matter, we perceive that what is going on at Geneva and what went on at Lausanne are themselves parts of a single movement, the movement of civilization itself. What is civilization but the effort to solve, on a world-wide scale, the ancient problem of unity and variety, of authority and freedom! Can independent and self-governing states, without surrendering anything that is essential to their political birthright, realize their common membership in a single civilized society and develop institutions that will bring that unity to visible and corporate expression? That is the problem of Geneva. Can independent and self-governing churches, without surrendering any conviction that is vital to their Christian faith, or any practice that is essential to the cultivation of their Christian devotion, realize their unity as members of the one Church of Jesus Christ and develop institutions that will bring that unity to visible and corporate expression? That is the problem of Lausanne.

This movement has been going on for centuries, both in Church and State, but during the last generation it has developed with unprecedented rapidity. When one looks back over the past thirty years and realizes what has been accomplished in the movement for Christian unity, one is amazed at the progress that has been made. Almost all of our existing organizations of a coöperative character fall within the span of the life of even the youngest members of our conference. To take our own country alone: the Federal Council began in 1908; most of the local federations of churches are later in date. The Foreign Missions Conference received its impetus

from the Edinburgh Conference of 1910. The Home Missions Council is still later. The International Movement in the form in which we know it to-day is a post-war development. The Lambeth Appeal was issued in 1920, and the union of the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational churches in Canada was consummated in 1925.

Nor is the movement for unity simply one between the denominations. Quite as important in its way is the movement for unity within the denominations. When I began my work as a Presbyterian minister, the Presbyterian Church in New York City was, so far as its missionary policy was concerned, a group of independent congregations. The committee, which operated on a budget of \$5,000 a year, conducted two small missions for Italians in rented rooms in corner stores. My committee was one of six similar enterprises carried on by New York Presbyterians, each in entire independence of the others. That was less than twenty-five years ago. To-day there is one Presbyterian Church in the City of New York with its bishop, called a moderator, its archdeacon, called the secretary of the church extension committee, a unified program for the city as a whole, and a budget of over \$100,000 a year, through which the stronger churches coöperate in the support and strengthening of those that are weak.

What has been going on in the Presbyterian Church has been going on in all the churches. When one considers the point from which we started, the wonder is not that we have not gone farther but that we have gone so far.

Let me try to sum up in a few sentences the nature of the change which has taken place. What is this movement for unity of which Lausanne is simply one of many other incidents?

(1) In the first place, it is a movement which, through a succession of experiments, is developing an organization through which Christians of differing polity, creed, and worship, may express the degree of unity to which they have already attained. This organization meets us in the local community in such movements as the Federation of Churches or the Community Church, and in groups of contiguous communities in what is known as the larger parish.

(2) It meets us in the denomination in a series of movements to strengthen the bonds between the different congregations, to develop a common missionary policy, and to put upon the stronger churches a larger share of the burden of the weaker. The successful completion of the pension funds in such churches as the Protestant Episcopal and the Presbyterian is an example of what I have in mind.

(3) It meets us in the country at large in such inter-church organizations as the Foreign Missions Council, the Home Missions Council, the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, the Council of Church Boards of Education, the International Council of Religious Education, and, especially, the Federal Council of the Churches.

(4) It is developing on an international scale through such agencies as the Lambeth Conference, the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance, and the corresponding bodies of Lutherans, Methodists, and Baptists, but, above all, through such interdenominational organizations as the World Alliance of the Churches and the continuation committees of the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work and the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order.

I say it has been developing its organization by experiment. It is an interesting fact, and less generally known than its importance deserves, that the organization of the League of Nations, with its assembly, council, and permanent secretariat and commissions, follows almost exactly the model worked out by our own Federal Council before the war.

The second point to note, and one even more important, is that the movement is generating a spirit and developing a philosophy of life — a spirit of trust rather than of suspicion, a philosophy of unity in variety.

As I was leaving the hotel at Lausanne at the end of the conference, I happened to meet a professor of one of the leading American Episcopal seminaries. This particular professor happened to be a High Church Episcopalian of the Anglo-Catholic type. It would be betraying no confidence to say that he came to Lausanne in great anxiety lest some truth which he

regarded as vital should be imperiled. But when I saw him, his fears had evidently been dispelled, for his face was shining.

"You know, Professor Brown," he said to me, "there is just one thing we have forgotten."

"What was that?" I said.

"The anathemas," he answered.

There is a whole philosophy of life in that answer. Lausanne is, so far as I know, the first general council of an ecumenical character which did not feel it its duty to anathematize those from whom it differed, if not in word at least in spirit. At Lausanne we came together to confer, not to legislate, and each was anxious not only to know the truth about his neighbor but to believe the best.

This does not mean that those who came to Lausanne were indifferent to truth, but that they recognized that truth was many-sided and that no man and that no church possessed the whole. They wished, above all things, to understand what others really believed, and still more what they revered in order that any further discussion of agreements and differences might be based upon facts and not upon mere opinion. This spirit, I repeat, at least on the scale in which it was manifested at Lausanne is something new in the Christian Church.

So much, then, for the movement of which Lausanne and Stockholm are parts, a movement which from a number of different centers is experimenting in the problem of unity through variety and is developing an organization to express the degree of unity to which we have already attained and a philosophy to explain and to define it. The significance of Stockholm and of Lausanne is not that either stands for any new principle but that through them this world-wide movement has for the first time found effective international expression.

The association of Stockholm and of Lausanne suggests the last point, of which it is necessary for me to remind you by way of preliminary analysis, namely, that the movement for unity has developed from two centers: One takes our present differences for granted and asks how, consistently, with these differences, we can realize our existing unity. The other takes

complete unity as its aim and asks how, in order to attain that unity, we can most quickly and effectively overcome our existing differences. The first found its most effective expression at Stockholm; the second at Lausanne. It will help us to understand the present situation, and so to define its possibilities, if we remind ourselves what each of these great conferences was, what it did, and what it failed to do. And first of Stockholm.

The conference at Stockholm, as its name indicates, was a conference on life and work. The impulse which led to its holding was the sense of need and shame, which followed the war, and the determination to see what could be done to mobilize the existing spiritual forces of the Christian Church so as to make such an experience impossible in the future. Questions of faith and order were, by common consent, passed over and attention was concentrated on the moral responsibility of the Church. The conference at Stockholm did three things:

(1) It prepared a series of reports dealing with the existing moral and social questions before the Church, questions such as race, industry, international relationship, etc.

(2) It issued a message summoning the churches to co-operation in the ministry of love.

(3) It appointed a continuation committee to serve as a clearing house between the different churches within the field of life and work. But Stockholm did not raise the question of the underlying philosophy which was to justify this service nor attempt to deal with the existing differences of faith and order which make its united accomplishment difficult.

This lack Lausanne attempted to supply. It put in the forefront the questions of faith and order which Stockholm, by common consent, had passed by. Its goal was organic unity, not simply federation, and it set itself to discover what were the obstacles which prevented that goal from being reached. It broke the conspiracy of silence which for so many years has obtained between Christians as to the things that really divide them, and it proved that far from frankness accentuating difference it brought those who differed closer together.

Three things the conference at Lausanne did. In the first place, it produced a statement of the Church's message to the world on which all those present agreed. In the second place, it secured a statement of points of agreement and of difference on each of the more important questions of faith and order which was satisfactory to all those concerned. In the third place, it demonstrated that, in spite of the differences which keep the Eastern Orthodox Church separate from the other Protestant bodies in many questions of faith and order, that church is now ready to coöperate with the Western churches in practical ways along the lines laid down at Stockholm.

But there were two things that Lausanne did not do. In the first place, it failed to define the proper relationship between the two great movements represented by itself and Stockholm. Report VII, which it was expected would deal with this subject, was not adopted by the conference for lack of time. In the second place, it failed to consider what, if any, intermediate steps could be taken to express the unity of the churches in their sacramental life, pending the time when full intercommunion is possible. This brings me to the point at which we find ourselves to-day and to the subject of our immediate interest. What, in view of the existing situation as thus analyzed, can we do to bring the Christian unity for which we all long and pray nearer?

Let us remind ourselves at the outset of some of the lessons which the experiences of the past few years have taught us. They have taught us, as we have seen, that we are in the midst of a real and growing movement for unity. But they have also taught us that this movement faces real and not merely imaginary obstacles. These obstacles are, in the main, of three kinds: In part they are differences of conviction. These can be dealt with only by the slow process of education and experiment. In part, they are misunderstandings and suspicions which are caused by ignorance of the real beliefs and practices of others. But the most formidable difficulty of all is the inertia which is due to laziness. There are multitudes of people in every branch of the Christian Church who would rather put

up with the disadvantages of the present situation than make the effort which is necessary to change it.

We have learned, in the second place, that these obstacles cut across denominational lines. We are divided to-day not primarily as Episcopalians from Presbyterians and as Lutherans from Baptists but as Anglo-Catholics from Evangelicals, as fundamentalists from modernists, as believers in a uniform and unchanging revelation from those who recognize the need and the possibility of variety in unity. There is not one of all the different bodies that met at Lausanne that has not its own internal unity to achieve and, in the case of some communions, these differences are so formidable as to make the problem of unity primarily one within the communion.

To take a single illustration, that of the Anglican Church. We were asked at Lausanne to look upon the Anglican Church as the natural bridge toward the united Church for which we long, because it is a communion in which Catholics and Protestants can live together harmoniously. Yet we learned that some of those who found it most difficult to live together were themselves Anglicans. And what we saw on a small scale at Lausanne we have since seen repeated in dramatic proportions in what has been going on in Great Britain in connection with the new Prayer Book.

Similar differences are found in each of the larger communions. Among those who took part in the debate on the sacraments, none were more helpful or contributed more largely to the desired result than American Baptists. Yet the English Baptists were conspicuous by their absence. The great opportunity which Lausanne would have afforded them to state their spiritual message and to explain their own conception of the Christian religion to bodies of their fellow-Christians who had never had the opportunity to understand it, they did not see fit to embrace. Before we can have the united Church for which we yearn, Anglicans and Anglicans, and Baptists and Baptists must learn to live and to work together on terms more intimate than they have yet succeeded in doing. And what is true of them is true of their fellow-Christians of other communions.

Another thing that we have learned is that our most promising approach to the problem of unity is along lines of life and work rather than of faith and order. There are three reasons why this is so. In the first place, this is the point at which the movement for unity as a whole began. It gives us our point of contact with the largest number of Christians and raises the least controversial questions. In the second place, in the continuation committee of Stockholm we already have the beginnings of an international organization in this field, whereas the Lausanne movement up to the present time has confined itself simply to discussion. In the third place, and this is the most important reason of all, the Eastern Orthodox Church, which represents one-third of Christendom, has officially committed itself to coöperation with its sister churches of the West along the lines laid down at Stockholm.

Finally, we have learned that however we may separate the two movements for practical purposes, the movement for life and work and that for faith and order, we cannot permanently keep the two apart. This fact appeared clearly in the debate on Report VII at Lausanne, where it was obvious that a very considerable number of those present were interested in organic unity because of its bearing on the practical lines of service expressed in Stockholm. Conversely, it appears that the federal movement in the form which it has hitherto taken is already reaching its limits; that, as represented in the local federations of churches, it is breaking down because the task to which it has set itself is too limited to capture the imagination of men; and that if we are to do what is our plain duty, even in practical matters, we must have some central body with real powers that is able to act for us all.

The first thing that we must do is to develop in each country strong coöperative organizations through which the church forces of each nation can be mobilized for practical service up to the point at which we are already one and then to relate these to the continuation committee of Stockholm in such a way as to make it possible for the Church to function internationally at least in the field of life and work.

That means for this country that we must develop our Federal Council till it becomes inclusive of all the non-Roman bodies; that we must make it flexible enough to represent the different viewpoints of those who make it up; and that we must secure a stronger and more effective central administration, so that we can deal effectively with the vast regions of paganism in city and country which are still unreached by the Gospel.

It is clear that this result cannot be secured by the simple method of federation which we have thus far employed. We must have a larger nucleus in which effective common action is possible. This means that the denominations of similar doctrine and polity must become organically one, and that as soon as that has been accomplished we must seek to unite groups of related families. In other words, we need in the United States a movement similar to that which has given us the United Church of Canada.

There is a danger to be guarded against at this point, namely, that in uniting some branches of the Church we divide others. This, as we know, has happened in the case of the Presbyterian Church of Canada. There are two ways to guard against this danger. We may either provide, within the united church, for independent self-governing units like the states in the United States, or we may relate the minority which elects to remain separate to the larger body as a part of a more inclusive federation.

In any event it will be wise to postpone negotiations for final organic unity until there has been sufficient time for practical experiment in the way that unity would work. Suppose, for example, in a single state the authorized representatives of the churches contemplating union, let us say the Methodists, the Presbyterians, and the Congregationalists, were to agree that, without prejudice to their present form of government, they would act in that state as if they were one, that they would refuse to compete with one another in the smaller communities, and in the larger cities, where more intensive work is necessary, would pool their resources in common enterprises jointly administered. Who can doubt that in ten years the moral

enthusiasm generated by such an experiment would spread over the whole Church and make organic unity possible.

The two steps already mentioned, namely, complete federation, and reunion of bodies of similar doctrine and polity, present difficulties, but they are not insuperable difficulties. It is when we attempt to deal with the divisions that are due to inherent differences of conviction that we meet our most formidable obstacles. How shall we deal with those groups like the Anglo-Catholics or the Southern Baptists, who have a theory of the Church which makes the recognition of other bodies as churches morally impossible?

Obviously, the only thing that can help us here is a change of conviction,—such a change as comes from fresh insight and deepened experience, and this is possible only through continued contact in the spirit of Lausanne. When we remember how far apart we were when we met at Lausanne and how much we have advanced in sympathy and understanding, there seems no limit to what may be possible when this process of education through contact is fairly under way.

This process has two phases: one of conference, the other of experiment.

We touch here on the crux of our difficulty, namely, that some of the bodies to be united now hold convictions which prevent them from trying the experiments which alone can determine what is God's will for the Church of the future.

Take the matter of the sacrament. This is the point at which at the present time our differences come to most acute expression. It is the matter which causes most grief to Christians and produces most scandal in the non-Christian world. If we are to make progress at all, we must find some way of dealing with this. Let us admit that at present indiscriminate intercommunion is not practicable. Some of us would go even further and admit that some of the reasons which make it impracticable are valid reasons, so far as they go. But the fact that full intercommunion is not immediately practicable should not blind us to the fact that occasional intercommunion, under conditions properly safeguarded, may not only be possible and

legitimate but may prove an indispensable step toward the fuller unity to which we look forward.

The need of such free experiment has been recently recognized in two influential quarters. In his interesting volume on the Lausanne Conference, Canon Woods, of Great Britain, draws an interesting picture of what might happen in a single community if all the Christians in it determined to translate the unity of which they speak into effective action, and pleads that some group will be found who will have the courage to make the venture.

Still more significant is a recent editorial in *The Living Church*, an important Anglo-Catholic organ of this country. Referring to a proposal made at Lausanne, but rejected, that, as a step forward toward full communion, we might at least begin by holding simultaneous communion—that is, a communion held at the same time, though at separate altars, as parts of a common service,—the writer advocates this procedure, not only as itself entirely legitimate but as a necessary step forward, and commends to the next continuation committee that provision should be made for such a simultaneous communion as part of the procedure of the conference.

The significance of this proposal is to be found not so much in the proposal itself as in the fact that those who make it refuse to accept the existing situation as final. If the plan suggested is not the proper way to begin, some other way must be found. The one thing essential is that we should not stand still. How can we advance unless we enlarge our experience, and how can we do this unless we exchange experiences?

But this exchange, if it is to be effective, must be mutual. If we who are Protestants ask our Anglo-Catholic friends to join us in common Communion, that they may learn by experience what is that real though spiritual presence that we find in the sacrament, we on our part must be willing to join with them in the discipline by which they cultivate the spirit of reverence. If the Episcopalian asks the Congregationalist to join him in prayer that God's Spirit will lead them both into the united Church, he must be willing to pray that God will

make him ready to give up anything which that Spirit may show him to be an obstacle in the way, even if that obstacle should prove to be the episcopate itself. One thing we dare not do, and that is to approach God in prayer with our own pre-conceived idea as to what His answer is to be.

For it is in prayer, after all, that our hope lies; not prayer in the old magical sense, as though God would do for us by miracle what our own prejudice and selfishness prevent us from doing for ourselves, but that God would open our minds and hearts to a larger view of His purpose for us and for His Church, that on the wider horizon thus opened to us we may see our way clear and be ready to go forward with humble and yet courageous heart along the path to which He points.

To sum up, these are the three duties which lie immediately before us: First, to act courageously upon the points on which we are now already agreed; secondly, to pray God for light upon the points upon which we differ; and thirdly, to resolve in our own hearts that by His grace we will move forward wherever He shall show that it is our duty to go.

A PRAYER FOR UNITY

O Lord, who in that last sad night,
Before Thou diedst for men,
Didst show Thy glorious, boundless love
To those about Thee then.

Remind Thy followers of to-day,
Who often disagree,
Thy very last most fervent prayer
Was for their unity.

Help us o'ercome the selfish pride
That mocks humility,
And lead us to that greater love
That proves our love for Thee!

—*Nicolaus L. von Zinzendorf.*

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH AND CHRISTIAN REUNION*

BY REV. BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, JR., D. D.
Rector of St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, Richmond, Va.

THERE are three recent events that have given the problem of Christian reunion a new importance, an urgency as a subject for consideration and discussion amongst Episcopalians. The first and foremost is, of course, that stupendous world event, the Great War, which has challenged us to reëxamine so many of the commonly accepted standards of our civilization.

Prior to 1914, we had come to accept our ecclesiastical divisions somewhat complacently — “unhappy divisions” we called them. The Great War, however, revealed in unmistakable terms *the sin of division*. Would the war have been possible in the face of a united Christendom? The churches with their ideal of peace on earth, professing loyalty to the Prince of Peace, could yet speak no effective word to stay the onrush of war. The cross fell in meekly behind the flag.

I recall an incident of Easter, 1919, that is deeply impressed upon my conscience. As a chaplain in the army, I was returning on a transport from France. With a Presbyterian chaplain I administered the Holy Communion to the Protestant soldiers and sailors on the starboard deck. On the port deck the Roman Catholic chaplain celebrated the Mass. It was reported to me by one of the members of my own unit that a Jew, looking up from the lower deck, had remarked that it was strange that on Easter Day the Christians had to worship on different sides of the ship!

A second event of less magnitude, which has given the problem of reunion a new impetus, is the World Conference

* An address delivered recently before the Maryland Clericus at the Church of the Holy Nativity, Baltimore.

on Faith and Order, held in Lausanne last summer, together with the regional conferences, held in Baltimore and Richmond, in continuation of the Lausanne Conference. Neither at Lausanne nor at the regional conferences was there any plea for *uniformity* in faith and order. It was frankly recognized that uniformity is neither possible nor desirable. Uniformity would mean the sacrifice of the hard won liberty of the individual conscience, of which our various Protestant communions are sponsors and witnesses.

What was emphasized was that some means of coöperation between the separated communions of Christendom must be discovered and effected, if the spiritual idealism and the moral energy of the Christian religion are to be directed to the accomplishment of its main objective rather than diverted to competition and controversy over secondary questions of ritual, and polity, and dogma.

Speaker after speaker, at the Richmond Conference, called attention to the demand for coöperation in the mission field, if Christianity is to present a vital message to the great non-Christian civilizations of the East. Here at home the challenge of secularism to Christianity is a no less serious ground for Christians to make common cause. In the face of such issues, our intolerance and misunderstanding of fellow-disciples of Christ become major sins — obstacles thrown across the path of the advance of the Kingdom of God. It revives the picture of an emperor fiddling while the eternal city is in flames.

A third event looking in the same direction is the action of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 in issuing an Appeal to All Christian People on the subject of Christian Reunion. While the Lambeth Conference speaks with no constitutional authority, yet its deliberations are fairly representative of the whole Anglican communion.

It is the purpose of this paper to present for critical examination certain specific proposals embodied in the Lambeth encyclical, together with certain allied proposals, which have no official sanction of the conference but which are suggested by practical considerations.

I. The Lambeth Conference and Non-Episcopal Ministries

There is perhaps no better commentary on the Lambeth Appeal than Dr. Headlam's Bampton Lectures, which preceded the Lambeth Conference by several months. Dr. Headlam not only anticipated the method of approach to reunion and the definite proposals, which were recommended by the bishops of the Anglican communion in conference assembled, but in one vital consideration he gave a bolder lead than the conference saw fit to adopt.

There was a popular saying among soldiers during the war in respect of army life, which seems pertinent to current proposals for Christian reunion, namely, "It's a great life if you don't weaken." While we recognize, with gratitude to God, the new spirit of approach to the subject which the Lambeth Appeal has manifested; yet one can but regret that, in its one definite proposal, the action of the conference should weaken in its high resolve. It is a splendid gain to have the bishops of the Anglican communion in conference assembled, "thankfully acknowledge that these ministries (i.e. the ministries of the non-episcopal communions) have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit *as effective means of grace*" (the italics are not in the original). If words mean anything, these words would seem to commit the Lambeth Conference to a recognition of the validity of the ministries and sacraments of a large group of Protestant communions. Furthermore, the episcopate is advocated as a basis for unity in organization, not on the ground of any theory as to its being an exclusive channel of grace, but solely on the ground of practical expediency, namely, "that it is now and will prove to be in the future the best instrument for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church."

When, however, the members of the conference come to a definite proposal, it must be confessed that they seem to draw back from a frank recognition of the validity of "these other ministries." The proposal is made that "if the authorities of other communions should so desire, we are persuaded that,

terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, bishops and clergy of our communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the one family life. . . . It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it to accept *a commission through episcopal ordination*, as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship" (the italics are not in the original).

If, as the Appeal states in the premises, "we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace," why should "reordination" be suggested as the way of acknowledging the fact? Such a proposal logically signifies either that we attach no real importance to ordination or that we still have a lingering doubt as to the validity of these non-episcopal ministries.

Dr. Headlam points a more excellent way in his lectures:—"If two religious bodies have thus united in their corporate capacity, each should solemnly recognize the ministers of the other and give them a commission under the new conditions. The Presbyterian, the Wesleyan, and the Congregational ministers in this country may have an adequate commission given them from their own body: they have no commission from ours. That we should give them. It may remain for further consideration how we should do it. I would only say that it should not be, in my opinion, with laying on of hands. That has already been done. The essence of a sacrament lies in the prayers of the Church. These prayers have been offered up with the apostolic custom of the laying on of hands. I do not think that should be repeated. The sacramental part of the rite has been performed. But the ecclesiastical rules have not been fulfilled. The essential part of them is the ordination by a bishop. That being a rule of the church, the church can dispense with it, and without it can confer authority on those already ordained. In the same way the other communities with which we unite may recognize our orders and give authority in their own community to us." (Op. Cit., pp. 306-7.)

II. Practical Steps Toward Reunion

Dr. Headlam has given us in these lectures not only a scholarly examination of the historical evidence as to the origin and early development of the Christian ministry, but also an admirable exhibition of the way in which a controversial subject may be handled without loss of temper and resort to sarcasm. In a book which affords so much opportunity for praise, it is perhaps somewhat ungenerous to call attention to two points in which it appears that the author fails to follow his own premises to logical conclusion. The two points are intercommunion and interchange of pulpits.

(1) Intercommunion

Dr. Headlam thus states his judgment on the subject of intercommunion:—"The fundamental reason against intercommunion of the kind suggested is not doubts about orders and sacraments. It is the fact that we are disunited. Intercommunion such as is proposed would be just as irregular with the Roman Church and the Greek Orthodox Church as it is with the Presbyterians or Congregationalists. . . . Let us make up our minds in what we disagree and then terminate our disunion. When that is done, then let us meet together in the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ as the symbol of restored communion. But I do not think that a half-sincere and wholly emotional common Communion will be a sound step toward reunion. I do not mean that the occasional admission of the members of other religious bodies when in danger of death or without their own religious administrations is not right. No rules should ever be pressed too rigidly. What I mean is that the proposed corporate Communion for those who are not united will do nothing but hinder reunion, for it will not be wholly sincere." (Op. cit., p. 289.)

The question arises whether such an argument does not undermine our confidence as to the real value of the sacramental principle. The invitation to the Holy Communion in the Prayer Book liturgy is extended in these terms,—“Ye who do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins, and are in love

and charity with your neighbors, and intend to lead a new life, etc." Surely few of us could sincerely respond to that invitation, if we interpret it as conditioned upon the fact that we are already in a perfect state of charity with all men. Rather we immediately proceed in the service to confess with humility that we have not yet attained, but we profess that it is our sincere desire and aim to be in love and charity with our neighbors; and thus it is we draw near in faith to take the holy sacrament, in order that we may thereby receive grace and strength to come nearer that which we would be.

Would not the same principles hold true as to intercommunion on the part of a group of Christians who at present belong to different communions, but who are earnestly desirous of finding a way to Christian unity? What higher interpretation could we take of the sacrament of the Holy Communion than that it is the means through which we may receive grace and strength to draw nearer to that unity? If we do not wait until we are perfectly holy before we come to the Holy Communion within our own fold, why should we wait until we have achieved "restored communion" before we of the different folds kneel at the one Lord's Table to receive grace to realize that unity which is our goal? To take a concrete illustration, suppose that a ministerial group, composed of episcopal and non-episcopal ministers in a given community, was earnestly conferring as to the ways and means of unifying its diverse Christian efforts in that community, what more natural step could its members take toward achieving the end in view, or what more visible pledge as to the sincerity of their purpose, than that they should receive together the sacrament of Christian love? If we are conscious that Christ's spirit is directing us in our deliberations and consultations, what more fitting response could there be than to ratify the fact with His own sacramental pledge of His spiritual presence?

(2) *Interchange of Pulpits*

The second point in which Dr. Headlam's argument for unity seems to halt is the proposal as to the interchange of

pulpits. He thus states his position:—"The proposed interchange of pulpits is a breach of church order. Now I never think that any merely ecclesiastical rule should be looked upon as so binding that it cannot be broken, if there is any good result to be attained. There are rules which fall into desuetude and are abrogated by being found needless or inconvenient. Many of those who are keen about some rules steadily ignore others, or, what is worse, evade them by some equivocation. But what good does such conduct really do? It will please some, perhaps; but it will irritate others. It will not help us to solve any fundamental questions. Interchange of pulpits among those who are not yet agreed on the fundamental principles of faith and order must be insincere; it should follow agreement, not prepare for it." (Op. cit. pp. 289-90.)

But, one may ask, why should interchange of pulpits follow agreement rather than be used as a means of preparing the way for such agreement? Surely there can be no breach of church order so great as the breach created by the very fact of our divisions, and any lesser rule of church order might reasonably and ethically be sacrificed if, through its sacrifice, it might become a repairer of the great breach. It is difficult to understand how we can hope for complete agreement or reunion ("that far-off divine event"), unless we cultivate the human opportunities for intercourse and fellowship which are near at hand. If we are sincerely desirous of Christian unity, then one logical step to take would seem to be to make frequent opportunities for securing evidence to the fact that the Holy Spirit is blessing the prophets of non-episcopal ministries. One of the chief barriers to unity is the prejudice that proceeds from ignorance. When we isolate ourselves and inhibit the practical opportunities for intercourse and understanding, it must often appear to our fellow-Christians of other communions that we are content to abide in ignorance and in disunion.

(3) *Interchange of Communicants*

There is yet another specific point on which the Episcopal communion, by relaxing a rule of order, might help remove a

stumbling block of misunderstanding between herself and the non-episcopal communions. Between some of the Protestant communions there exists a comity by which a communicant in good standing in one denomination is received into the fellowship of another denomination on the basis of a letter of dismission and commendation.

On the other hand, when a communicant of one of the Protestant denominations would become identified with the Episcopal communion, the transfer is usually effected only by means of the rite of confirmation. As in the case of reordination, this appears to give evidence of the fact that we do not validate the confession of faith previously made by the individual in the communion of his inheritance. A Presbyterian woman who had recently married an Episcopalian and desired to unite with her husband's church, expressed to me very frankly the obstacle that this ecclesiastical rule presented to her mind and conscience. She had made her confession of faith, publicly confessed her loyalty to Christ. To her the demand that she be confirmed seemed to cast a reflection upon the solemn profession she had already made. As she expressed it, it had something of the appearance of not honoring the check of a trusted friend.

There is here no question of giving up the historic rite of confirmation for those who have been baptized and trained in the Episcopal Church. It becomes obvious, too, that in the case of the Presbyterian cited above, had she been received into the Episcopal Church by means of a letter of transfer, the breach of order would be only temporary. For the children of such a home would in the natural course of events be presented, at the age of discretion, to the bishop to be confirmed by him.

For such temporary breach of order in the interest of reunion, one of the resolutions adopted by the Lambeth Conference gives a somewhat cautious sanction, viz.:

"In view of the prospects and projects of reunion, the bishops of the Anglican communion will not question the action of any bishop who, *in the few years* between the initiation and the completion of a definite scheme of union, shall countenance

the irregularity of admitting to Communion the baptized but unconfirmed communicants of the non-episcopal congregations concerned in the scheme."

When one reflects upon the centuries in which our divisions have been given free rein and when one, further, reflects upon the contradiction of the Christian spirit which they exhibit, it would not be extravagant to take a liberal interpretation of "the few years" in which we might countenance an irregularity in a rule of order to bring nearer the fruition of Christ's prayer that "they may all be one as we are one."

The Protestant Episcopal Church possesses a strategic position, not in numbers, but in its influence as a mediator between the historic churches, so-called, and the Protestant communions in the cause of reunion. Could there be a higher mission for her to perform? For its accomplishment, however, she must be willing to lose something of her own self-conscious life that she may find the larger life of Christian fellowship.

He went about, they said,
In doing good;
He challenged men to follow,
If they would.

He knew no creed, nor system,
But to live
A life of loving service,
And to give:

To give of cheer and faith,
Was His appeal;
To hearten; hope inspire;
The hurt to heal.

Thou Church of God,
Unite in one accord:
Enough, if be, the servant
As his Lord.

Give Thou of life and love:
Meet Thou the test:
Bid them that love and serve,
To join the quest.

—Hiram B. Harrison.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

False Steps Toward Unity (No. 1)

WE have watched with interest the developments of the recent unity conference in Baltimore. Returning from Lausanne, Dr. Ainslie proposed almost immediately that a supplementary conference, more or less local, should be held in his own city of Baltimore.

In the program advertised in advance was provided an evening Communion service at a Presbyterian church, at which, it was advertised, a Presbyterian minister would be the celebrant and would be assisted by three other clergymen, Protestant Episcopal, Lutheran, and Baptist, respectively.

The Living Church very carefully abstained from comment. That it would be possible to find a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church who would be willing to serve in that capacity we did not doubt; out of more than six thousand clergy there are individualists who are ready to vary from the customs and requirements of the church in practically any manner that may be desired.

But in order to do that, any clergyman would naturally be obliged to place himself in the position of repudiating the customary Anglican position and defying Anglican discipline. Anglican delegates to Lausanne, from all the churches of that communion, to a man carefully avoided any such action. No doubt there are more or less Anglican clergymen who view the Anglican position in that respect as a mistake, but seldom indeed do we find one who does not conform to it as a matter of loyalty. Throughout all Christendom this phase of the Anglican position is perfectly well understood, and most people in other religious bodies are good enough to refrain from placing an Anglican priest in a position where he must either defy the well-known position of his own church or seem ungracious by refusing a request to do so.

But the mere advertisement of the intention to place a clergyman of the Episcopal Church in this position was notice

enough that normal churchmen were not expected to participate in this conference. In that no injustice to them was intended or done. It is perfectly legitimate for members of those religious bodies that are closest together, and in full communion with each other, to hold mutual conferences of their own, and we hope they will do so more and more, in ever increasing measure, until they are able to break down all denominational barriers between them. The fact that the Episcopal Church finds it impossible to throw its lot in with them on their terms is reason enough why its normal members should not be expected to participate in conferences in which their own position will be treated with contempt.

But when those who arranged this conference deliberately determined to place one of our clergy in that position, it is evident that they were seeking something else than a unity based upon loyalties.

If Lausanne was of any value at all, it was in that it encouraged no man to be disloyal to the position of his own church. Its care was, first, to establish the exact position of each factor represented, and then to see what progress, if any, could be made in correlating those positions. If any delegate had stood upon his own individualism and repudiated the position of the body that had sent him, he would thereupon have ceased to be of any value. Happily no such incident arose.

So the plan for the recent Baltimore conference differed decidedly from that of Lausanne. Instead of asking Anglicans and Protestants to sit at a round table and discuss, courteously and frankly, why their respective positions made it impossible for their respective clergy loyally to participate in a common communion, the attempt was made to obtain an Anglican clergyman who would act according to the recognized position of Presbyterians and Disciples rather than to that of his own church.

The point we wish to make is that to do this, even if the attempt had been successful, would not have been a step toward unity. It would simply have witnessed to the fact that here and there is an Anglican clergyman who is willing to act as a pure individualist instead of as a man under authority. And the encouragement of such individualism promotes the exact opposite of unity.

So at Baltimore the inevitable happened. The advertised program naturally suggested to normal churchmen that they were not wanted in such a conference, and they kept away. As

for the reverend individualist who had expected to assist the Presbyterian celebrant, when the time came he wasn't there. Residing in another diocese, he discovered, at the last moment, that bishops have something to say about what outside clergymen may do within their dioceses, and rectors of parishes something to say about clerical gentlemen intruding unasked within their parish bounds. He learned, in short, that there is a reign of *law* within the Episcopal Church. According to his own explanation, he "was dissuaded only because of the expressed opinion of the bishop coadjutor and the rector of one of the churches, whose 'consent' it appeared necessary for [him] to secure, in order to be technically within the laws of the Episcopal Church."

Pity he did not know that there were "laws of the Episcopal Church" before he placed his hosts, not to say himself, within this unpleasant position!

But did not those estimable men who planned the unity conference know it either?

Why should they have deliberately encouraged disloyalty on the part of a clergyman?

And could they not see that they were not promoting unity in doing it?

So now the sectarian press is printing the usual, time-honored slurs against the Episcopal Church. Everybody knows what they are like.

Strange, strange, strange, that advocates of unity, thoughtful and devout men such as those who promoted this Baltimore conference, cannot recognize this undoubted *fact*:

The Episcopal Church holds certain firm convictions that are different from the convictions of Presbyterians and Disciples. It is no more "narrow" or unworthy for Episcopalians to adhere to those convictions than for Presbyterians or Disciples to adhere to theirs. Presbyterians and Disciples are at perfect liberty to confer together and to create unity among themselves; but if they care to enlist the Episcopal Church in the same laudable cause, they must recognize the *fact* that the position of the Episcopal Church differs from their own, and that loyal members of that church will, in the last analysis, uphold their own position — and ought to. If, by careful search, Presbyterians and Disciples can find a clergyman of the Episcopal Church who is willing to act upon the Presbyterian or Disciple tradition rather than upon that of his own church, they are not thereby promoting unity, but rather are doing

that which to the rest of us seems a rather contemptible thing; and, as this incident shows, are simply promoting bad feeling and misunderstanding. We cannot feel that their obvious good intentions are sufficient really to excuse them.

So the net result is this. By reason of the unnecessary blundering on the part of well meaning people at Baltimore, misunderstandings are just a little worse than before, Christian hatreds are just a little more intensified, and Christian unity removed just a little farther away—all in the interest of Christian unity.

One wonders why this should have been necessary. Is Lausanne so soon forgotten? Is open contempt for the position of another body the way of peace?

[From *The Living Church*, Milwaukee, Wis.]

The Baltimore Conference on Unity

To the Editor of The Living Church:

I READ *The Living Church* regularly and find myself sympathetic toward many of its utterances. Your editorial on the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference, however, prompts me to tender a reply.

First, regarding the Christian Unity League and its recent conference in Baltimore. The league, which is composed of all communions, including Episcopalians, was organized in May, 1927, and at that time planned its conference to close with the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Consequently, whether Lausanne in August celebrated the Lord's Supper or not, that had nothing whatever to do with the plan of the Baltimore Conference, which was planned in May—three months before Lausanne.

Also, you may recall that at Lausanne I was made chairman of the committee on future work. I mentioned to Bishop Brent and the committee that, as editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*, I had discovered leagues, fellowships, and circles for unity springing up in all parts of the world, mentioning by name some of them, and particularly the one in Baltimore. My suggestion was to have these, as far as possible, become auxiliaries to the continuation committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order, that committee to direct the activities of these auxiliaries. Bishop Brent and others approved of this

plan, and so I incorporated it in the committee's recommendations. On the floor of the conference, however, you vigorously proposed a revision of the recommendations, eliminating these features entirely and, at the instance of Bishop Brent, I seconded your motion, for there was no great issue involved.

After the meeting that evening and during the days following, several—both Europeans and Americans—approached me, expressing the opinion of the need of the independence of these leagues, fellowships, and circles for free adventures in Christian unity, which could not be done in delegated bodies like the World Conference on Faith and Order. The wisdom of this, to my mind, was quite evident, and I am glad you moved the revision of the recommendations, although I am not at all sure that you had this in mind at that time. However, the Baltimore Conference is the result of one of these adventurous groups.

Second, there was no thought of being discourteous to the Episcopal Church. There were Episcopalians who favored an interdenominational celebration of the Lord's Supper, with an Episcopalian as one of the celebrants. To have gone ahead and not invited an Episcopalian, for fear of arousing the dissent of some Anglo-Catholics and some of your bishops, would have been an inexcusable discourtesy to the Episcopal Church. Four Episcopal clergymen, including one of your bishops, had part on the program of the Baltimore Conference—a larger percentage than that of any other communion—and I am told by a Baltimore Episcopalian that, on the evening when the Lord's Supper was celebrated, there were a dozen or more Episcopal clergymen who partook of the Lord's Supper. I do not know who has been your informant for you to say that the Episcopalians kept away from the conference. They were there in large numbers like other free Christians, both clergy and laity, being an important part of the 650 persons who registered.

And, too, your argument that it was discourteous to have invited an Episcopalian when we knew that there were some in the Episcopal Church who did not favor intercommunion, would apply with equal force to the Lutherans and Southern Baptists, unless you think that what applies to other communions does not apply to the Episcopal Church. To follow your argument further, to hold any kind of Christian unity conference would be discourteous to all the communions represented at the Baltimore Conference, because many of the leaders in these communions are opposed to organic unity, which is what you and I contend for. Consequently your position takes us into a blind

alley and leaves us there; and therefore, with no desire to offend you or any other in the divided Church, perhaps I should say now that, as a definite contribution to Christian unity, the Christian Unity League expects to hold another conference next winter, closing it with the celebration of the Lord's Supper, in which all communions, including Episcopalians, will be asked to share. It is not that we desire to offend the least in the Church, but persons interested in Christian unity are asking for interdenominational celebration of the Lord's Supper and I see no good reason why we should not do what so many earnest, faithful Christians desire to be done. That course appears to me to be preëminently reasonable and hopeful for Christian unity.

Third, instead of the Baltimore Conference retarding Christian unity, as you expressed in your editorial, it furnished an occasion for the expression of the finest Christian unity ideals and, at the same time, showed, to my regret, that some Anglo-Catholics and some Episcopal bishops are factors who are retarding Christian unity. Never before have Roman Catholics, Unitarians, Universalists, along with Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, Disciples, and sixteen other communions, sat down together to discuss Christian unity, and they appeared to like it. The one requirement for membership in the conference was the acceptance of Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior. Besides, the findings, a copy of which I am enclosing you for your information and, if you will, for publication in *The Living Church*, were among the most advanced in their outlook and the most hopeful that have been passed by any Christian unity conference. Other cities are asking for similar conferences.

Fourth, in your contention for Anglican loyalty to the age-long traditions and practices of the Anglican Church, I take it that you would, of course, likewise contend that a Presbyterian should also be loyal to the age-long traditions and practices of the Presbyterian Church, and so on with all the other two hundred denominations. Or would you say that the Anglicans should contend for party loyalty, but not necessarily the Presbyterians for loyalty to their party? What a ghastly contention this denominational loyalty business is with Christian unity as a fading mirage!

I am not a denominational loyalist, and my contention is that one of the most important pathways for Christian unity lies by adventures of such men as the Rev. Frank H. Nelson,

rector of Christ Church, Cincinnati, who assisted a Presbyterian and those of other communions in the celebration of the Lord's Supper at the Ohio Pastors' Conference in Columbus in January, and the Rev. Beverley D. Tucker, Jr., rector of St. Paul's Church, Richmond, Va., who recently announced that St. Paul's would not require confirmation for membership in that church of those Christians who come from other churches. These, and those in other communions who are making similar ventures, are making contributions to the unity of Christendom by displacing denominational loyalty for loyalty to Christ. Every denominational barrier is a rebuke to Christ. When the first Roman Catholic registered in the Baltimore Conference you would perhaps have had us to say: "You must not come in this conference. Your church authorities forbid Catholics to meet with Protestants in friendly conference. It is our duty to see that you remain loyal to the practices of your church." This would have been just as unthinkable on our part as to have celebrated the Lord's Supper interdenominationally in Baltimore and ignored the Episcopalians, who are active members of the Christian Unity League and are leaders in Christian unity throughout the world.

Fifth, judging from the tone of your editorial, I would like to know frankly if your position really is, that because the Episcopalians have a special priesthood and the Presbyterians and the rest of us Protestants have no special priesthood, therefore it is a violation of Christian ethics for Episcopalians to be invited to come with Presbyterians and Disciples and other Protestants to the Lord's Supper; and that intercommunion should not come until all the rest of Christendom accepts the validity of the Anglican priesthood. Would it be courteous to the Roman Catholics, who are past masters on validity of orders, for Protestants to accept Anglican orders of the priesthood when the Roman Catholics deny the validity of Anglican orders of the priesthood? If Protestants are anticipating the acceptance of the order of priesthood, would it not be more courteous and fairer to all concerned to go direct to Rome, as Newman and many others have done, instead of stopping at the halfway house of Anglicanism? Have you not raised a question in the realm of courtesy that is taking us away from Christian unity entirely?

After all, is it not a fact that the Lord's Supper is for you and me in equal penitence before God for this age-long manifestation of unbrotherliness among the Lord's disciples? If you

are going to stand apart when multitudes of other Christians are at the Lord's Supper in penitence before God for our scandal of division, are you sure that you are not in the wrong? I am asking you to answer these questions through your columns as frankly as you discounted the Baltimore Conference and thereby to give an interpretation that will be helpful to better understanding and lift your interpretations out of the humorous into serious consideration.

Baltimore.

Your friend,
(Rev.) PETER AINSLIE.

[From *The Living Church*, Milwaukee, Wis.]

As Another Episcopalian Sees It

To the Editor of The Living Church:

I HAVE been trying thoughtfully and prayerfully to understand the spirit which actuates your editorial on the Baltimore Unity Conference, which you entitle "False Steps Toward Unity." Coming from a periodical of my church, this editorial has made me heartsick.

I know you love the church. You cannot love it more than I do. The feel of the church has been bred in my blood by three generations of clergy, serving in conservative Maryland. You will pardon my stating also that I know as much about the recent Unity Conference and its unhappy incident as yourself, for I was personally in touch with the whole proceeding.

Taking these things into consideration, and doing my utmost to understand your position, I say again, I am sick at heart over your editorial. I think perhaps what first rouses this feeling (though fortunately I can see the amusing side) is your apparent assumption that you are speaking in behalf of the whole church, and your implication that anyone who does not agree with you is a mere "individual . . . ready to vary from the customs and requirements of the church," *i.e.*, he is not a "normal churchman." Of course this matter of participation in the Unity Conference is a matter of opinion, but that does not put outside the pale those who honestly disagree with you! You take it quite for granted that an Episcopal clergyman who reads a collect and pronounces a benediction at a Protestant service of the Lord's Supper conducted in a Presbyterian church "places himself in the position of repudiating the customary

Anglican position and defying Anglican discipline." If this were true (and I have yet to find anything in the constitution, canons, or rubrics to bear it out) I wonder what our Lord would say as to such Anglican discipline! The problem is worth thinking about from this larger aspect.

Aside from this debatable matter, I know, my brother, that your editorial is unjust. It is unjust to the clergyman of our communion who had accepted an invitation to participate in the service in question. He accepted in good faith, ignorant that any good churchman would object to his participation. He stayed away out of respect to the wishes of the Bishop Coadjutor of Maryland; he was not formally inhibited. He showed more courtesy in this action than you do in your uncharitable references to him.

You were unjust to the good churchmen and churchwomen of Baltimore. As a matter of fact many good "normal churchmen" did attend the conference, and quite a number — both clergy and laity — were present at the last service and partook of Communion. There might have been more had there not been a large Episcopal meeting the same night.

You were unjust to our Protestant brethren who planned the Unity Conference. This is hardest to bear. Twice you speak of their actions as "contemptible." That cuts like a whip-lash, for I personally found them much more Christian in their attitude toward us in this matter, than we toward them. And the articles in the "sectarian press," against whose "time-honored slurs" you declaim, had much less venom than your stiff-necked editorial. To be sure the *Christian Century* headlined the incident: "The Empty Chair at the Lord's Supper." But I am now wondering, in view of later developments such as your editorial (I speak as one bred for generations in the church), I am wondering if, in the largest catholic sense, it was not right?

(Rev.) JAMES A. MITCHELL.

Baltimore.

[From *The Living Church*, Milwaukee, Wis.]

Dr. Opie Explains

To the Editor of The Living Church:

YOUR editorial in the issue of February 25th is such a reflection on this writer as to call for a rejoinder. I trust that your

sense of fairness will insure me like space to that of the editorial, "False Steps Toward Unity."

It seems really inexplicable to some of us of the so-called Low Church party (though I myself repudiate such tags and titles), that *The Living Church*, which represents a considerable school within the Protestant Episcopal Church (I use the official and legal title of the church), can find any justification whatever in referring us to "laws of the Episcopal Church"—and in so strongly indicating to your readers that we are disregarding them, even to a degree that calls forth such a phrase as "a rather contemptible thing" (which you use in referring to the promoters of the Baltimore Unity Conference, and, by intimation, to this writer).

In the act which was contemplated on my part, but which act was not carried out when I discovered the sense of opposition which existed on the part of some of our church authorities in Baltimore, the matter in question, so far as legality is concerned, was purely one of interpretation of canon and not a proposed act of a rebel, or one accustomed to disregard the church's laws. It is inconsistent, I say, for *The Living Church* to grow sarcastic about *the law*, when this periodical is champion and spokesman for a group in the church which consistently and openly and rebelliously flies in the face of the "laws of the Episcopal Church." For example, the law says, "If any of the consecrated bread and wine remains after the Communion, it *shall not be carried out of the church*; but the minister and other communicants shall, *immediately after the blessing*, reverently eat and drink the same" (*Prayer Book rubric*, page 240). This is consistently disregarded by practically the whole group represented by the editor of *The Living Church* and his school within the church. And it is not a question of interpretation, but of defiance of *Protestant Episcopal law*. Again, only last night a visitor to my study told of one of your group who refused to communicate any persons who had not just previously "confessed" to the priest. An act of defiance of law. Also, this same priest, representing the same following, refused confirmation to those who had not mastered the "Hail Mary," according to my informant. And your group habitually disregards the laws of the church in respect to the prescribed ritual allowed by the rubrics and rules of this church.

Would it be quite "Christian" of me to quote your editorial, "Pity he (they) did not know that there were 'laws of the Episcopal Church' before," etc., etc.? Let me assure you that

this writer did know there were laws. But, frankly, he did *not* know (nor does he yet know), that the "parish" (in the canon forbidding a minister of this church to officiate in another parish without consent of the rector) of an Episcopal clergyman in any city or town embraced the whole territory of the said city or town, including the Presbyterian church! Indeed I have two letters on my desk from two different bishops of the church, indicating that the proposed participation in the joint Communion service could not be construed as an *illegal* act—and they were both opposed to my doing so. One of these bishops denied that he had said I "had no right," etc., though, in his opinion, I would have been beyond the "bounds of wisdom and propriety," had I carried out my intention. The other bishop commended me for refraining—"especially since you waived your individual freedom in deference to your advisors You acted with a fine sensibility for the corporate opinion of our church," etc. This bishop says further, "As I see it, you were well within your rights as a Christian minister to accept the invitation to participate by reading a passage of Scripture or by offering a prayer, or by pronouncing the benediction" (any one of which three things only I had *agreed* to do in this disputed service); "but where such action might lead to misunderstanding or seem to involve and possibly compromise the church, it is exceedingly doubtful to my mind if the cause of Christian unity might have been promoted," etc.

My proposal to "read, to pray, or to bless," in this service, especially since I dissented from appearing in the robes of the church, as suggested, was not the proposed act of one habituated in the matter of breach of canon or rubrical law. It was merely the proposal to indicate my own personal willingness to affiliate, on my own initiative and responsibility, with other Christians in a service which is preëminently the service of brotherly love and communion—a service for the Father's children at the Father's table. (Are we of the Episcopal Church the only children God has? Or are we merely the elect of the Father? I cannot so contend.)

It would appear that if any of us are to be in a position to question another's "loyalty to the church," he should exercise every care to see that he himself is at least not habituated in disloyalty.

Constructively, it would seem also that the canons of the church should be so phrased as to allow of no two interpretations which are on the face of it capable of two extreme

interpretations. If "parish" means *territory* (that is, not merely the church, missions, parish house, property, and, conceivably, homes of Episcopal families and places and things affiliated with some Episcopal church, as such, but everything and every place surrounding a given Episcopal church, including Presbyterian, Baptist, Jewish, Greek, Mohammedan, and other edifices and places of worship and group assemblage) — then this ought to be made plain — together with just how much *territory* a given "parish" does embrace. And what shall we say of families in a parish and of other "localities" that are, perchance, five or ten miles distant from the designated *seat of the parish*, say the rectory or the church itself? Fortunately (?) no such dilemma as would normally inhere in an interpretation of this canon, however, existed in the Baltimore case — since it was learned that a certain Episcopal church, or "parish," is made legally to include the "whole city" and, I believe, county, of Baltimore. This by reason of the Vestry Act, by which, I was informed, all of Baltimore's vestries were automatically incorporated, and by virtue of which the entire territory of the city was made to fall within the "parish" of a given Protestant Episcopal church. This is a most "inclusive" policy — and one evidently not previously disclosed to the First Presbyterian Church of Baltimore, where the National Unity Conference was held.

If the writer's *proposed action* in this matter seems to some reprehensible and to others contemptible, and to still others, disloyal — perhaps this explanation may at least mitigate that reaction.

(Rev.) THOMAS F. OPIE.

Burlington, N. C.

[From *The Living Church*, Milwaukee, Wis.]

The Baltimore Conference on Unity (No. 2)

WE are obliged through lack of space to hold for another issue most of the correspondence received for this issue except that relating to the Baltimore Conference on Unity. Upon a detail of that conference we commented in *The Living Church* under "False Steps Toward Unity." That detail was the evening Communion service that had been planned in connection with the close of the conference, at which, it was said, a Pres-

byterian minister would be the celebrant and he would be assisted by Protestant Episcopal, Lutheran, and Baptist ministers respectively.

The Protestant Episcopal minister referred to did not appear when the service was held. His explanation is now printed in the correspondence department, as are also a welcome statement from Dr. Peter Ainslie, president of the conference, and a comment from one of our own clergy in Baltimore. These, with our comments of last week, might well stand as a sufficient statement of the entire matter, with justice to each of the points of view that are so well presented. Such would be our preference, especially since we recognize the grave delicacy of the present situation, when one unhappy word may easily lead to estrangements that would prove new barriers to the unity which each of us so earnestly desires.

Yet to be silent now would not only be unjust to these several writers, who have raised points that deserve consideration, but it would also be an act of cowardice. Lausanne began a new era. We are no longer to run away from differences, nor to leave consideration of these to controversialists who delight in polemics. Lausanne is only six months away and already new differences have arisen such as must be met frankly in the hope that they may be solved in accordance with the Lausanne spirit. To let these differences run on rather than to meet them, would mean new rifts between men and churches that are trying to agree.

In one respect the Lausanne and the Baltimore conferences occupied totally different grounds. The former was official, consisting chiefly of accredited delegates from formal churches; the latter was unofficial, attended by whomsoever would. We grant that a greater latitude is possible in an unofficial than in an official gathering.

And we believe thoroughly in voluntary organizations for promoting unity. We highly commend the League for Church Unity founded by the Bishop of South Carolina.

Dr. Ainslie recalls an incident at Lausanne that, perhaps, was too trivial for the papers to report; we think it was not mentioned in *The Living Church*. He had presented a report, as he says, which recommended, among other things, the establishment by the continuation committee of affiliated unity organizations in every community. [We are quoting from memory; only the paragraphs of his report that were adopted are recorded in the official volume, *Faith and Order*, p. 407, and

this was not.] Mr. Morehouse moved to strike out that provision on three grounds, as we recall it: first, that the delegates to Lausanne were chosen with only delegated authority for one specific purpose, and that the creation of such organizations would exceed their authority; second, that to do this on the scale proposed was a task that would require a very formidable organization and would involve very great expense and many officers, secretaries, and organizers; third, that purely voluntary, unofficial, and self-formed organizations of that sort would be more effective and less costly. Dr. Ainslie graciously seconded the resolution; we had supposed it was because he agreed with its purport; he now says it was because "there was no great issue involved." In any event, that paragraph of his report was stricken out. But his present indorsement of the plan for the independence of those gatherings "for free adventures in Christian unity" seems entirely in agreement with Mr. Morehouse's third point, though, as he intimates, Mr. Morehouse had then no knowledge of his plans for the Baltimore Conference. We are pleased, therefore, that Dr. Ainslie and Mr. Morehouse are more in agreement on this matter now than they were at Lausanne; though certainly Dr. Ainslie's graciousness in seconding Mr. Morehouse's resolution then, when, apparently, he had not come to see the greater advantage of informal and unofficial gatherings over formal and official ones, should not be forgotten.

But does it promote unity for such a conference to range itself specifically against the official position of one of the churches whose participation is desired? It is not that "there were some in the Episcopal Church who did not favor intercommunion." Rather, the church itself does not, though there are "some" within her ranks who hold that position to be a mistake.

True, the Episcopal Church is very careful not to pronounce that a celebration by one who is not a priest is certainly invalid. She asserts no negatives, such as would seem to question the power of Almighty God to confer grace through channels which He has not disclosed to her. The last Lambeth Conference made this quite clear. We think that Dr. Ainslie has failed to do justice to the fact that the Episcopal Church *corporately* adheres to the position that only a priest may celebrate Holy Communion in such wise as to be valid *for its own people*, though undoubtedly he can cite instances of clergy who dissent from that view. The disciplinary canons of the Episco-

pal Church are based on the expectation that her priests will loyally conform to that position. That is why a bishop is given authority to inhibit a priest who desires to minister unlawfully in his diocese; that is why the rector of a parish (where parish boundaries are defined) is given authority to prevent unauthorized ministrations within his parish bounds.

In defining this position, we fear that we shall be joined by Dr. Ainslie with those "some Anglo-Catholics and some Episcopal bishops [who] are factors [in] retarding Christian unity." Dr. Ainslie has stated lucidly and clearly the manner in which he believes Christian unity ought to come. He is right in observing that "some Anglo-Catholics and some Episcopal bishops" are factors in retarding Christian unity *based on those premises*. We should even go farther and maintain that practically the entire Episcopal Church with practically, if not actually, all its bishops, are equally factors. Ergo, to him, these all are "retarding Christian unity."

But Dr. Ainslie cannot fail to see that the converse of this is also true. The Episcopal Church, with the authority of the entire Lambeth Conference, has proposed a definite platform looking toward unity. Dr. Ainslie dissents from that platform. Ergo, then, according to Dr. Ainslie's reasoning, some Christian unity editors (God bless them!) and some distinguished Protestant ministers "are factors who are retarding Christian unity."

Which is only to say that thus far we have not all come into agreement as to what should be the basis for this Christian unity which we are all trying to promote. It is just because we disagree in this matter that conferences are worth holding at all; but if we must all first agree to Dr. Ainslie's postulates as to immediate intercommunion, which is exactly the point at issue, why should we confer at all? Unity on the basis of everybody accepting Dr. Ainslie's position would, of course, solve the problem. Just as unity on the basis of the position of the Episcopal Church would do the same, if everybody would agree to it. But what we are trying to get at is this: If some factors in Christendom believe in unity based on complete intercommunion *now*, and some do not, what shall be done to bring the two factors together? Or shall we simply each try to promote that form of unity that seems right to himself, and speak of the others as "factors who are retarding Christian unity"?

Dr. Ainslie stands frankly on this latter basis. "The Christian Unity League," he says, "expects to hold another conference next winter, closing it with the celebration of the

Lord's Supper, in which all communions, including Episcopalians, will be asked to share." That means that it will be a conference of those *who are already agreed* concerning the most vital question at issue. He may be surprised to have us say that we believe it an excellent plan. Among the sad conditions in Christendom, perhaps the saddest is that the modern Protestant churches, that are in substantial agreement in every important respect, and between whom complete intercommunion prevails, cannot get together in a single consolidated organization. That, obviously, is what Dr. Ainslie understands by Christian unity. And it would be a marvelous, a stupendous thing were he able to accomplish it—a united Protestantism. It would be a long step toward that still greater thing, the unity of Christendom. And the act of intercommunion in which all the factors to such a conference could wholeheartedly unite would be one of the most momentous events in the whole history of the gropings of the Christian world toward unity.

It would, of course, leave out the Episcopal Church, except to the extent that those of whom we have spoken as pure individualists—not desiring to use a stronger term—might choose to participate. But the Episcopal Church does not wish to be a dog in the manger. We have certain definite ideas as to what should constitute Christian unity. We desire a unity *within the old Church*; not a unity based on the creation of a new one. But because Protestants thus far do not accept our ideas of unity is no reason why they should not create a unity of their own, according to their own convictions. If Dr. Ainslie wishes to confine his efforts to uniting such bodies and individuals as are able to-day to participate in a common Communion, it still is a magnificent conception. It may be, in the providence of God, the next step in the long road to the still greater reunion.

For ourselves, we shall stand emphatically for the position of *unity based upon loyalties*. And we agree that this should "apply with equal force to the Lutherans and Southern Baptists." Where it may appear that Lutherans and Southern Baptists disagree with Anglicans, we shall not ask individualists among them to disregard the discipline by which they are morally bound, and accept our position as a condition of conference with us, but shall ask the most loyal, the most devoted of Lutherans and Southern Baptists, who can be counted upon to stand by the convictions of their respective churches, to sit down around a table with equally loyal and convinced Angli-

cans, talk freely about their differences, learn mutually, with us, why we stand apart to-day, and try whether we can find a way to correlate those differences in the future. It is not a quick road toward unity. It is not an easy way. It will not produce immediate results. But it will not involve us in trying to undermine the loyalties that men ought to respect in dealing with other men on the highest plane. *This is the Lausanne way.*

And the Christian Unity League, which has the advantage of Dr. Ainslie's splendid, consecrated leadership, will similarly be promoting a unity limited to those who are already agreed as to the immediate feasibility of intercommunion, and in its communion all, "including Episcopalians," "will be asked to share." That some of these must abandon their own loyalties, according to the interpretation of their ecclesiastical superiors, in order to do so, that some misguided people, "factors who are retarding Christian unity," will still feel it a thing "contemptible" to seek to provoke breaches of discipline in a sister communion in order to promote one's own ideas of what is fit, that a unity conference thus planned will necessarily be limited to those who already are chiefly in agreement while the rest of the Christian world is charitably to be summed up in the phrase we have already quoted—*This is the Baltimore way.*

There are undoubtedly Episcopalians who will prefer this Baltimore way. It is easy to see that it will seriously provoke discord in the Episcopal Church. Those churchmen who wish to signify their dissent from the official position of their church can easily make this common Communion the expression of their contempt for that official position and for those who hold it. It lends itself easily to use as a partisan test. We can anticipate polemic organizations making every effort to promote the attendance of churchmen, and we can see not only that among their kind of churchmen they will have a considerable measure of success, but also that they will be able to cause grave embarrassment to those bishops and rectors who still believe in maintaining the way of loyalty through the discipline of the church.

Yes, and we can see how pleased Dr. Ainslie will be at this measure of breaking down the discipline of the Episcopal Church. But—up from the subconsciousness of his mind there will ever and anon come to the surface of his mind the thought, "There are Christian people who think this is a contemptible thing for us to be doing." He will argue to himself how absurd is such an idea. It will please him to reflect that these are

simply "factors who are retarding Christian unity." He will be perfectly certain that they are wrong because he will know that he is right. But, just because Dr. Ainslie is the refined, sensitive, devout, and spiritually-minded soul that he is, there will keep coming back again before his consciousness: "There are Christian people who think this is a contemptible thing for us to be doing."

Because the church that created the Lausanne ideal, and then spent nearly twenty years in promoting it and finally brought it to life, is not likely to go back on that ideal within less than six months after it has scored its success. And this is the Lausanne ideal:

When differences between the several factors in Christendom can be exactly determined, let both parties sit quietly around a table and discuss those differences, in the hope of finding a way to reconcile them. Let each party be perfectly courteous to the other. Let neither seek to take advantage of the other. Let both express sincere penitence for any part that either has taken in producing disunity. And in the fear of God let them try to find the way out of the impasse that has existed for so many generations.

And the alternative suggestion made at Lausanne by Dr. William Adams Brown seems to us vastly superior to the one-sided plan presented by Dr. Ainslie. It is that *simultaneous* celebrations of Holy Communion by all the participating factors in any unity conference should be planned. According to this, if Episcopalians, or Lutherans, or Southern Baptists, or any other group, could not wholeheartedly coöperate in a common Communion service such as might be arranged by Dr. Ainslie, they each be encouraged to provide such a service according to their own several convictions. Then, from the central position of all these churches, be it altar or table, there would simultaneously arise to Almighty God a mighty volume of intercession that He would guide them, and all the factors in Christendom, into the way of unity and peace. In a large measure, the *will to unity* already exists, and in the providence of God Dr. Ainslie has had a large share in promoting that will; but thus far we do not see the way. We never shall see it until the Holy Spirit leads us into it. By such a plan no loyalties would be invaded, no new disunities would be created, no partisan aspects would be given to participation in the conference by anybody. And we can promise that "Anglo-Catholics" would show by their ready coöperation in offering the holy sacri-

fice that they neither desire nor intend to be "factors who are retarding unity."

Yes, we stand emphatically for a unity based upon loyalties and tested at Lausanne. But, absurd as it may seem, we also believe that Dr. Ainslie will ultimately stand upon the same platform. He cannot undo his splendid record during two decades or more. He cannot unwrite those splendid editorials always promotive of brotherly affection one for another. He cannot dissolve his own leadership. He cannot indefinitely be contemptuous toward men with whom he disagrees. In short, he cannot be other than himself.

It remains only for us to add that where Dr. Ainslie has corrected us in matters of fact concerning the recent conference, he, undoubtedly, has the better way of knowing what happened, and of course is right. As to such details, we are grateful to him for the corrections.

[From *The Living Church*, Milwaukee, Wis.]

Doorways to Unity

It was our unhappy duty to report the Episcopal Church's fiasco at Baltimore, when our representative, who had been invited to assist at the interdenominational celebration of the Lord's Supper, was advised by a bishop and a local rector that the cause of unity would be better served by a "vacant chair" at that table of Christian Fellowship. Against every pronouncement by the Episcopal Church of desire for Christian unity such ecclesiastical bigotry as that issuing from Baltimore cries out denial. Fortunately there are those in the Episcopal Church who are not too timid or too pharisaical to back up proclamations in behalf of unity with action.

A quite different story from that reported from Baltimore comes to us from the Diocese of Southern Ohio. There was held in Columbus the ninth annual Ohio Pastors' Convention. At that convention there was a celebration of the Holy Communion, with one thousand clergymen, representing thirty denominations, present. Not only were several of the Episcopal clergy participants in that service, but the Rev. Frank H. Nelson, rector of Christ Church, Cincinnati, and one of the most distinguished clergymen in the entire Middle West, was one of the consecrating ministers at the Holy Communion. We are indebted to the Rev. Philip W. Hull, rector of St. Andrew's

Church, Dayton, Ohio, who was present, for the following striking description of what took place:

The summit of this great meeting was reached when there came to pass a service of Holy Communion in which about one thousand ministers participated. And by common testimony it was an experience which stirred deeply the souls of all, and sent them forth with a new hope and a new joy. Jesus was singularly present with His disciples on that Thursday morning.

No doubt the majority of the ministers held reservations of mind in approaching this service of mystical fellowship and worship. The fact that it had not been done in centuries in so representative a circle made them a little self-conscious. The unfortunate situation at the closing of the Lausanne Conference accentuated this timidity. And many wondered how, after two hours and forty-five minutes of addresses, discussion, and business, a proper transition could be made in so barren a hall for such a solemn service.

The chairman made an explanatory statement from the platform. Every minister was extended a cordial invitation to participate in this Communion. If, however, there were those present who, for reasons of conscience, would be unwilling to participate, they would be excused without embarrassment and their views would be respected. Something began to happen. It was inarticulate, but every one could feel it. Four covered Communion tables were reverently borne into the body of Memorial Hall. Dr. W. O. Thompson, former moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly and president emeritus of Ohio State University, took a position in the center. Behind the Communion tables sat the Rev. James Best, United Presbyterian, Steubenville; the Rev. W. H. Hudnut, Presbyterian, Youngstown; the Rev. J. H. Harris, United Brethren, Westerville; the Rev. Frank L. Brown, Methodist Protestant, Columbus; Bishop Theodore S. Henderson, Methodist Episcopal, Cincinnati; the Rev. Nicholas Van der Pyl, Congregational, Oberlin; the Rev. Frank H. Nelson, Christ Church (Protestant Episcopal), Cincinnati, and the Rev. John M. Moore, Baptist, New York. They wore black gowns. A vested choir of ministers filed quietly to the stage. The form of service used had been compiled by Dr. Van der Pyl, from several of the denominational Communion services. This had been printed and distributed.

A hush of solemn significance fell over the whole convention. The service began with the singing of "Jesus, the very thought of Thee with sweetness fills the breast." One thousand ministers of nearly thirty denominations were gathered about the Lord's table to break the Bread of Life, to receive the Christ into their hearts and to re-dedicate themselves to His service. The doubts and mental reservations were fast dissipated. Never was there more devout participation in Holy Communion by any congregation. The service ended with the hymn, "Crown Him with many crowns," and the Benediction by the saintly Dr. Thompson.

A great forward step had been taken in Protestantism such as had never been possible before.

Among the other Episcopal clergymen who took part were: the Rev. Sidney Sweet, St. Paul's Church, Columbus; the Rev. J. L. Langhorne, St. Philip's Church, Cincinnati, and the Rev. L. W. Barton, Trinity Church, Newark.

The Episcopal Church has no better friend in any denomination than the Rev. Peter Ainslie, who has devoted his life to promoting Christian unity and under whose auspices the recent conference was held in Baltimore. In the Open Forum of *The*

Churchman, after stating that he had spoken many times in behalf of the World Conference on Faith and Order, in which he had been interested since its inception, he added:

But I have had asked me from the floor after speaking, and also in private conference, if it was not the purpose of the Episcopal Church to make us all Episcopalians. To this question I have emphatically affirmed that it was not the purpose of the Episcopal Church to do such a thing, and I have given many reasons why I could answer so positively. *But when the Episcopal Church refuses to sit with Presbyterians and Methodists and other communions in celebrating the Lord's Supper, it makes it very difficult for me to answer in the negative the question that I am so frequently asked.* [Italics ours.] . . . I shall not be satisfied until we succeed in clearing the Episcopal Church of those charges that are so frequently made against it and that can be done only by a practical demonstration in the equality of all Christians before God in the observance of the Lord's Supper.*

We honor Frank Nelson for what he did in Columbus. It would not have occurred to him to do otherwise. Furthermore, Dr. Nelson recognized full well that in participating in this great interdenominational service of the Holy Communion he was representing hundreds of like-minded clergymen in the Episcopal Church, who refuse to have any ecclesiastical author-

* The Episcopal Church and the Lord's Supper

To the Editor of *The Churchman*:

Your editorial on the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference is most heartening. We will never get anywhere in Christian unity unless we break away from established customs. I have done this in my own church, which is an immersionist denomination, in receiving into its membership people whose baptism has been by sprinkling or pouring. There is no denomination that can expect that all the others are going to come to that one, whether it be the Roman Catholic Church, Episcopal Church, Presbyterian Church, or my own church. We are not asking people to give up anything except those barriers that hinder fellowship. Where barriers to fellowship exist there is something wrong, and Christians must be courageous enough to remove the wrong, irrespective of what it is.

I have been with the World Conference on Faith and Order from its earliest inception. I have spoken a great many times in its interest and I am thoroughly committed to it, but I have had asked me from the floor after speaking, and also in private conference, if it was not the purpose of the Episcopal Church to make us all Episcopalians. To this question in every instance I have emphatically affirmed that it was not the purpose of the Episcopal Church to do such a thing and I have given many reasons why I could answer so positively. But when the Episcopal Church refuses to sit with Presbyterians, and Methodists, and other communions in celebrating the Lord's Supper, it makes it very difficult for me to answer in the negative the question that I am so frequently asked.

I was particularly eager in the Baltimore Conference that an Episcopalian would be one of the celebrants, not only as a mark of Christian fellowship on the part of the leading denominations but for the sake of the Episcopal Church to convince others that its motives in Christian unity were not to have other denominations to join it. Yet, so long as the Episcopal Church keeps the position of "better than thou" at the Lord's Supper, while others are meeting there in equality before God, it does give some ground to the charge that I have had so frequently to meet and makes it very much more difficult for me to answer.

I am a friend of the Episcopal Church and have scores of Episcopalians among my very dear friends, and I am particularly eager that that church shall stand out as an advocate for Christian unity with untrammelled purposes and unquestioned motives. We almost succeeded in the Baltimore Conference. In the next conference of the Christian Unity League the attempt will be made again. If we fail there it will be made again and I shall not be satisfied until we succeed in clearing the Episcopal Church of those charges that are so frequently made against it and that can only be done by a practical demonstration in the equality of all Christians before God in the observance of the Lord's Supper.

With appreciation of your courteous and prophetic utterances as expressed in your editorial, I am,

PETER AINSLIE.

Baltimore, Md.

[From *The Churchman*, New York.]

ity inhibit them from doing that which they have a full canonical, as well as Christian, right to do.

It is not without significance that this happy participation took place in the Diocese of Southern Ohio. It is a diocese within which the minds of the clergy function with freedom. No more than to the clergymen who had a part in the service would it have occurred to either Bishop Vincent or Bishop Reese to advise against such a manifestation of Christian Fellowship.

It is high time for all Episcopal clergymen who believe in such "a practical demonstration in the equality of all Christians before God in the observance of the Lord's Supper" to make such demonstrations. They will by so doing bring to multitudes of Christians, as well as to Peter Ainslie, renewed hope of Christian unity and a revitalized Church.

[From *The Churchman*, New York.]

The Tendency to Ape Rome

THE eucharistic revival in the papal church has operated in two directions. It has modified the uncompromising attitude of the papacy toward other Christian bodies, and it has produced a trend toward the eucharistic congress idea in the Protestant denominations. The newer attitude of the papacy based upon the eucharistic revival is expressed in the *Commonweal* (Roman Catholic) in a discussion of the religious situation in Russia. It says: "We must not think too freely of the defections and weaknesses of religious Russia, but rather of the work to be done now, under difficulties incomparably great, by men who—however regrettable the results of schism—have retained the eucharistic core of the church, and who, even in the darkened present, are conscious of the blessedness of their fathers." That is, the Russian church, separated from Rome for a thousand years, still retains the sacrament of the eucharist, and with it the core of orthodoxy and of catholicity. The principle involved is that the identity, validity, universality and saving efficiency of the Church inhere and become expressly effectual in the eucharist. The bigger the crowd, the better the sacrament.

Is there any such tendency in Protestantism? On the surface is a new and growing custom of celebrating the Communion

in connection with Baptist conventions of various kinds and in union meetings. Some other Protestant bodies have long celebrated the sacrament in their general denominational meetings, such as Methodist conferences, but the practice among Baptists and in union meetings is an innovation. Indeed, such a practice was formerly regarded among Baptists as one of the unscriptural perversions of the meaning and form of the Lord's Supper. No question of the sort is raised here. We are merely sketching facts to supply material to our readers for fruitful thinking.

Is this new and growing practice accompanied by characteristic interpretations of the ordinance? Is the old meaning of a simple memorial symbol still clearly preserved? Perhaps the best answer to this question is given in a sermon by Charles Clayton Morrison preached as a Communion sermon at the recent Conference on Christian Unity held in Baltimore. In the midst of a luminous and inspiring discourse he said: "In Christianity there is one baptism. That is to say, there is but one initiation into the Church of Christ. There are no further 'degrees' to be taken by which a higher and yet higher status may be attained. There is but one baptism. He that is once initiated has been initiated into all that there is. No privilege or added status is conferred by other baptisms. The Christian fellowship is the ultimate democracy. And the Lord's Supper as a continuing ceremonial speaks in the accent of democracy. Its function is to conserve and guarantee the equality which baptism confers."

Of course there is but one baptism. But does it make any difference what that baptism is? And is baptism the initiation into the Church of Christ? What then is the Church of Christ? Is it the function of baptism to confer equality — an equality not otherwise attainable among believers? If so, what kind of equality is so conferred? Is it the function of the Lord's Supper to guarantee equality? If so, what kind of equality and by what sort of guaranty? Are none but the baptized admissible to the Supper? Suppose that a Quaker should present himself, or a convert who has not yet been baptized; in such a case what is to be done? Suppose it should be discovered that some are present who thought mistakenly that they had been baptized — some of them even clergymen officiating at the celebration!

Now these are not our questions. They are questions necessarily involved in Mr. Morrison's impassioned appeal in justification of a celebration of the Lord's Supper as a church ordinance in a meeting that had no church standing whatsoever.

We are not even objecting to the observance. We leave all questions of its propriety to those who assumed responsibility for it, who seem to have been of one mind in it, and who declare that they were greatly blessed in it. But we are calling attention to some things that inevitably invite thought. How far are we going in the direction of the eucharistic congress? How far are we going to limit the recognition and expression of true Christian fellowship to an occasional sitting together at the Communion table? How far are we going to use such celebrations as occasions to lampoon those followers of Jesus who decline to conform? How far are we ready to join the spokesman of the papacy in identifying genuine Christianity with the formal maintenance of the sacramental and "eucharistic core"? How far are we going to celebrate the Communion under circumstances that compel a revision of our doctrine of salvation, of baptism and of the church in harmony with the theory of Romanism?

We reject the idea that the democracy and equality of the Christian religion originate in baptism. Baptism never confers them. They spring not from any ceremony, but from the spirit of Christ in the believer. Nor can we accept the idea of the Church as the world fellowship of the baptized. To us faith in Christ is the touchstone, test, fundamental fact and creative source of all valid and genuine Christianity. In this union with Him is the equality of Christian fellowship. This, kept full and vital, is the guaranty of democracy. This, and not the eucharist, however interpreted and celebrated, is the heart of the Church and the core of Christian catholicity.

[From *The Baptist*, Chicago.]

Interdenominational Communion Service in Ohio

THE climax of the ninth annual Ohio Pastors' Convention, conducted by the Ohio Council of Churches in Columbus, was reached, most observers agreed, when approximately 1,000 persons, nearly all of them clergymen, joined in partaking of the Lord's Supper at an interdenominational Communion service just before noon on the closing day.

The service was carried out with impressive and reverent dignity, under the leadership of Dr. William Oxley Thompson, president emeritus of Ohio State University, former moderator

of the Presbyterian General Assembly and former president of the Ohio Council of Churches.

Eight other officiating ministers assisted Dr. Thompson and 24 clergymen selected from the membership of the convention acted as deacons.

A white-robed choir of ministers occupied the stage of Memorial Hall. Above their heads was the motto that had been suspended across the stage throughout the convention, the words from Jesus' prayer, "that they may be one, even as we are one."

Dr. Thompson, wearing a black Geneva gown, stood on the floor at the front of the auditorium. At intervals across the hall were the four Communion tables, with two ministers, also black gowned, seated at each table. The 24 deacons occupied the front row of seats, facing the tables.

The assisting ministers were: Rev. James Best, United Presbyterian, Steubenville; Rev. W. H. Hudnut, Presbyterian, Youngstown; Rev. J. H. Harris, United Brethren, Westerville; Rev. Frank L. Brown, Methodist Protestant, Columbus; Bishop Theodore S. Henderson, Methodist Episcopal, Cincinnati; Rev. Nicholas Van der Pyl, Congregational, Oberlin; Rev. Frank H. Nelson, Episcopal, Cincinnati, and Rev. John M. Moore, Baptist, New York.

In addition to these eight denominations, there were among the clergymen acting as deacons, men of the following denominations: Christian, Disciples, Evangelical Synod, and Evangelical Church.

Ministers of a score or more of denominations participated in the service.

The service followed a ritual especially compiled for the purpose by Dr. Van der Pyl, who drew his material from many historic sources, combining forms of service used by the Church through many centuries and now in use in different communions. Interspersed through it were verses from several of the great hymns of the Church, the common inheritance of all denominations. The whole form of service was distributed to the congregation in printed form, and moved forward without the necessity of any announcements from the presiding minister.

A "Hymn of Assurance of God's Mercy," led by the choir, opened the service — "Jesu, the very thought of Thee with sweetness fills the breast. . . ." Then came the "Call to Worship," read by Dr. Thompson, followed by the "Invocation and the Lord's Prayer," also read by him. Between the sections of

the invocation the congregation sang two verses of "Break Thou the Bread of Life" and "My Faith Looks up to Thee."

A "Prayer of Thanksgiving and Consecration," by the presiding minister was followed by the distribution of the bread, accompanied with soft music by the convention organist, Rev. Vernon Wade Wagar of Warren.

As a "Hymn of Trust," the congregation sang, while the deacons were returning to the tables, "Just as I Am," after which the cup was distributed. A "Hymn of Dedication," "When I Survey the Wondrous Cross," was sung as the deacons again returned to the tables.

Next was the "Prayer of Intercession" by Dr. Thompson, followed by "Crown Him with Many Crowns," sung as a "Hymn of Praise."

The service then closed with the following benediction: "Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is well pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen."

The impressive, deeply religious nature of the service was the subject of comment from many of the participants as they filed quietly out. In the minds of many was the consciousness that they had been present on a history-making occasion — the first Communion service in which so great an assemblage of Protestant ministers of practically all denominations had joined in one fellowship to renew their vows of allegiance to their common Master.

Later in the day the convention adopted a resolution urging a repetition of the service at next year's convention.

"We record with deepest reverence and humility our profoundest thanks to Almighty God for the leadership of His spirit in bringing this convention to the holy hour which we experienced in the celebration of the Lord's Supper," said the resolution. "We regard this as an epochal event, in the movement of interdenominational good will. Every man who shared in this beautiful service will go away with a warmer regard for his brother in the ministry and with a more earnest desire to answer the prayer of Our Lord and Master, "that they may be one, even as we are one."

No more impressive religious ceremony was ever carried out in Ohio—or perhaps one should say anywhere in America—

than the great Communion service on the closing day of the Ohio Pastors' Convention. For the first time in history, nearly one thousand Christian ministers, representing many denominations, united in the observance of the Lord's Supper.

By that act they gave expression not only to their common loyalty to one Master but also to their common bond of brotherhood for one another as fellow-followers of Him.

The service was the high spiritual peak of the convention. In it was evidence that the coöperative movement among Ohio churches and ministers is more than a mere union for purposes of efficiency and convenience — that it has deeper significance, implying as it does a far-reaching fellowship that transcends sectarian lines and sees the Church of Christ as one great body moving forward toward great common goals.

The men who here as members of one inclusive Christian body shared in this sacred observance are more nearly immune than ever before to the temptations of sectarian prejudice and jealousy.

[From *The Ohio Christian News*, Cleveland, O.]

OPINIONS ON THE FINDINGS OF THE BALTIMORE CHRISTIAN UNITY CONFERENCE

Ministers of All Denominations Should Be Educated Together

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: There is undoubtedly much value in the findings of the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference. My experience leads me to approve most heartily finding no. 6, where emphasis is placed upon the extreme value of having ministers of all denominations trained together for their great calling. This is one of the most powerful agencies that can possibly be developed for promoting in the deepest way those spiritual sympathies which must eventually lead to closer coöperation and ultimate union of all like-minded denominations.

I recommend as an essential step toward the promotion of unity a country-wide and authoritative study of the distribution of church forces, especially among the smaller communities of the United States. It is in the small communities that competition is doing most harm. It divides the witness of the Christian community, and it also is the real source for the dismal fact that more than fifty per cent of the ministers of Protestant churches in this country are uneducated men. This deplorable situation cannot be remedied until it is exhaustively studied and the actual facts are published and continuously kept before the mind and conscience of the whole country.

Hartford, Conn.

W. DOUGLAS MACKENZIE,
President of Hartford Seminary Foundation.

A Register of Progress in Christian Thinking

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: The findings of the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference are a notable register of progress in Christian thinking and a clarion challenge for advance in practice. Especially significant are findings nos. 3 and 6, in call for practical application of theories now almost universal in Protestantism. Scholarship knows no geographical boundaries, nor ecclesiastical barriers. A group of scholars selected from different denominations forget for the time sectarian alliances and think together on basis of fact and

reason, and their conclusions are accepted as valid. Their findings naturally find lodgement in congenial soil in their respective denominations, and in due time bear fruit.

Finding no. 6 is not so revolutionary as it may appear to those unfamiliar with what is going on in our educational institutions. "Denominational control" is not much in evidence in most of our colleges. The "control" is more apparent in the theological seminaries. But in these the control is nominal rather than actual. There is no question but that the control is actual as long as the charter requires a member of a given denomination to be a member of its board of trustees or a member of its faculty. The suggestion of no. 6 was inevitable from such a representative Christian group as the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference.

Chester, Pa.

MILTON G. EVANS,
President of Crozer Theological Seminary.

First Example of Denominational Cooperation in Higher Education

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I am particularly interested in section 6 of the findings of the Baltimore Conference, looking forward to the time when denominational schools "will be controlled by several denominations instead of by one." Carleton being a college of the Congregational type is entirely independent of outside control and is managed by a self-perpetuating board of trustees. On the other hand it has maintained throughout its history relations of cordial coöperation with the Congregational churches of Minnesota, and in 1916 established similar relations with the Baptist churches of the state and later with the Episcopal churches. We now have three great denominations coöperating in our work. The Baptists included us in their New World Movement fund, which brought us about \$225,000. So far as I know, this is the first important example of denominational coöperation in higher education in America.

Northfield, Minn.

DONALD J. COWLING,
President of Carleton College.

American University Is Another Illustration of No. 6 Item in the Findings of the Baltimore Conference

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: The American University in Washington, D. C., so completely illustrates article six of the Baltimore Conference findings, that I cannot refrain from calling your attention to it. The university is incorporated by

acts of Congress. Its incorporation makes Methodism responsible for the continuity of the institution and gives Protestantism an opportunity to express a breadth of program that is practically unlimited. The university has forty-three trustees at the present time; twenty-two of them residing in the District of Columbia and twenty-one are residents of ten states. These trustees represent seven of the great Protestant denominations. There are at least ten denominations represented by one or more instructors on the faculties of the three schools at the present time. The university is not interested in establishing a theological school. It does seek to establish a school of religion, with as broad a scope as its present program. We would like to see established in the nation's capital a federated school of religion, for which the American University would furnish the standard degree-giving institution and also furnish the foundation studies or foundation courses for such a school. We would like to see steps taken to secure a small selected number of students, representing the various denominations, and the selection of one or more of the most distinguished professors from the various denominations, and federate this group of students and professors in a school of religion, which school would carry forward a program such as suggested in article six of the findings of the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference.

Washington, D. C.

L. C. CLARK,
Chancellor of the American University,

Seminaries Should Include the History of Christian Union in Their Curriculum

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: Concerning sections 3 and 6 of the report of the Baltimore Conference permit me to say that I can see no reason for any possible dissent from the former of the two findings. Section 6 might involve practical difficulties which some institutions would find insurmountable. There is no reason, however, why every seminary should not include a course in the history of Christian union in its curriculum and should not endeavor to establish the widest possible contacts with representatives of other shades of thought. Obviously, no minister is properly equipped for service in the pastorate of any modern communion who is not thoroughly conversant with the origin, history, and status of the various movements toward unity during the last century. Moreover, he should be in a position to speak with intelligence concerning the theological positions of those with whom he does not himself agree. The teaching of sectarianism is out of place in a seminary designed to meet the needs of the present day pulpit.

Indianapolis, Ind.

FREDERICK D. KERSHNER,
Dean of the School of Religion, Butler University.

Voted to Change the Charter of the School

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I am very much interested in the findings of the Baltimore Conference and agree heartily to the recommendations made by the League. I am particularly interested in item no. 6 concerning denominational schools. It may interest you to know that at the mid-year meeting of our board of trustees on Tuesday, February 7th, it was voted to make the changes in their charter which this article of the recommendations suggests. You will also be interested to know that for a number of years we have selected our teachers for their personality, their Christian ideals, and their preparation for the work, not taking into consideration their denominational membership. In a school like ours, which accepts students of all denominations and faiths, we must be careful not to emphasize denominational teaching. Another thing which may interest you is the fact that we offer to ministerial students of any denomination our regular ministerial rebate of \$100 a year. As a Baptist school supported in some measure by Baptist money, we are, I feel, doing a greater work by broadening the scope of it as I have above outlined.

Factoryville, Pa.

CURTIS E. COE,
Principal of Keystone Academy.

In Accord with Findings

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I have read the findings of the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference, and find myself in perfect accord with these.

Middlebury, Vt.

PAUL D. MOODY,
President of Middlebury College.

Need Is Closer Coordination and Cooperation

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I am in hearty accord with all the points in the findings of the Baltimore Conference. I have read with especial interest the 6th item dealing with denominational schools. In my own institution we have for years had on the faculty persons from other denominations and also have made no distinction whatever so far as students are concerned from the very day of the founding of the college. The admission of persons from other denominations on boards of trustees may be a little more difficult as these matters are usually provided for in college charters. In our own case, although a strictly denominational college, we have had alumni trustees who are not

members of the denomination. In my opinion, the chief objective, for the present at least, should be a closer coördination and coöperation of various denominations locally so that duplication of effort shall be avoided and real federation or coöperation secured.

Naperville, Ill.

E. E. RALL,
President of North Central College.

Attacking the Common Task in a Unified Fashion

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I find myself in substantial agreement with the findings of the Baltimore Conference, and am moved to express the following opinions.

I. It is to be expected that the program contemplated will be a long one; this should not render us complacent in the face of unnecessary interruptions and delays.

II. If Christians were to attack their common tasks in a unified fashion this would develop the spirit of Christian unity, which might be expected in turn to necessitate greater unity of organization. I believe this method of approach from immediate tasks is more promising than approach from the standpoint of differing creeds, separating organizations, and existing prejudices.

III. In line with opinion II, I believe interdenominational faculties and boards of control in educational institutions are less important than a broad "Christian unity" point of view on the part of faculties and boards of control, however constituted.

Reading, Pa.

A. ROGER KRATZ,
Dean of Evangelical School of Theology,
Schuylkill College.

Raising the Educational Standard of the Ministry

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I have read the findings of the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference. I think that I am in substantial agreement with the positions taken. Two items in this great and worthy ideal always bother me. One is the degree of arbitrary control which might be necessary and the other is the ever present possibility that any sort of union might prove ephemeral since people will always reserve the right to start an ecclesiastical enterprise of their own. One important approach to the problem seems to me to be the thorough education of the ministry in all of the various Protestant camps. I think that that achievement, more than any other, would raise the leaders above the level of mere denominationalism.

Kalamazoo, Mich.

ALLAN HOBEN,
President of Kalamazoo College.

Practical, Progressive, and Thoroughly Desirable

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I have read with great interest the findings of the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference. These recommendations interest me very much and appeal to me as being practical and progressive and thoroughly desirable.

Wichita, Kansas.

W. O. MENDENHALL,
Friends University.

Sympathetic With the Position

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I find myself very sympathetic with the position taken by the conference, and substantially in accord with the various points enunciated. I wish the movement great success.

Alfred, N. Y.

BOOTHE C. DAVIS,
President of Alfred College.

Willing to Subscribe to Every Bit of It

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I hope something really worth while will come out of the work of the Baltimore Conference. I am willing to subscribe to every bit of it. I presume the only thing we can do is to keep hacking away, and finally some morning, when we are thinking of something else, we will find our efforts to be perfected.

Hamilton, N. Y.

GEORGE B. CUTTEN,
President of Colgate University.

Newer Educational System Calls for a Wider Outlook

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I am thoroughly in sympathy with the finding no. 6 of the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference. I do not wish to belittle for a minute the work which the denominations have done in establishing colleges in the early days of this country. It made possible the education of thousands, when educational facilities without these colleges would have been very meager. It gave a definitely Christian tone to American education. But the newer educational system calls for a wider outlook and a closer coöperation in all organizations of education. The training of teachers has changed and we are training students less toward denominational ministries than toward a fuller life of Christian service in various professions. I feel that the great

contribution the denominations have made to education has been in the Christian spirit they have left impressed upon the educational system.

Evanston, Ill.

WALTER DILL SCOTT,
President of Northwestern University.

Bringing into the Board of Trustees of a Denominational College Those from Other Denominations Would Be Helpful

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I think there can be no question of the value of securing for the board of our denominational colleges men who represent the broadest outlook upon education and who are free from any denominational prejudice. Wherever possible I should feel sure that bringing into the board of a denominational college representatives of other denominations would be found helpful.

New Haven, Conn.

JAMES R. ANGELL,
President of Yale University.

Perhaps Looks in the Right Direction

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: Without going into every article deeply, I should be inclined to support them all, with the exception of the 6th. In the main, I think they are all well worded and strike at very fundamental matters. Our denomination, the liberal branch of the Dunkards, known as the Brethren Church of America, is open-minded and is willing to coöperate very fully with other Christian bodies. The old branch in the past has not been so liberal, but we have always held to an open policy. But I am not yet ready to subscribe fully to article six. We have our seminary in connection with the college and, as we are situated, I could not personally agree. However, perhaps the article looks in the right direction.

Ashland, Ohio.

EDWIN E. JACOBS,
President of Ashland College.

Believes in the Denominational School

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: (1) I believe in denominational schools as such and therefore cannot sympathize with a move that would seem either to do away with them or to lessen their denominational flavor.

(2) A denominational school like our own has a double advantage. We have a religious life shared in by faculty and students that could not be as

rich as it is if we were forced to meet the needs of a number of dissimilarly minded people, and being in affiliation with Harvard University our instructors are in touch with the instructors of all departments of the university, and especially with those of the theological school. Our students sit in classes with men of all denominations at Harvard, and Harvard men of all denominations come over here and sit in classes with our men.

(3) Assuming that a school is primarily intended to be of a denominational nature, to be directed by denominational teachers, and to train for the ministry of a denomination primarily, I see nothing but confusion in the suggestion that on the board of trustees there should be representatives of other denominations. Pure denominationalism in an isolated community might tend to narrow-mindedness. Denominationalism in a larger academic community does not necessarily tend in this direction at all.

(4) Your suggestion that a course in Christian unity be established in the various schools is admirable, and I sincerely trust that those who take such a course may not only be members of various denominations but may frankly share their convictions among themselves.

(5) I question the possibility of unifying the theological seminaries unless it is most skilfully done, and unless in some incomprehensible way the present religious advantages of the denominational school can be preserved.

(6) The suggestion that denominational papers shall become more interdenominational can do nothing but good. However, much will be lost if the church press becomes purely interdenominational.

The fundamental thought that I am trying to express is that, although we lose a great deal in not coming in closer touch with each other in our theological schools, we should lose a more essential part of our training if we became too interdenominational. Denominationalism need not necessarily mean antagonism. It may mean the full expression of a point of view precious to a certain group without denying that other groups ought richly to express their own point of view.

Cambridge, Mass.

HENRY B. WASHBURN,
Dean of the Episcopal Theological School

A Progressive Movement Toward Complete Unity

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I heartily approve the findings of the Baltimore Conference and trust that the Christian Unity League may continue in its wise and progressive movement toward a more complete unity of all disciples of our Lord.

Hightstown, N. J.

R. W. SWETLAND,
Headmaster of Peddie School.

Scientific Theology and Ecclesiastical Authority Are Incompatible

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I believe that the suggestion of article 3 of the Baltimore Conference is good if it were practicable. The fact is, however, that you could not get the creedal churches to accept as trustworthy the historical method of Biblical interpretation. At the best it would only be a weak sort of minimum that would be gained. I believe that scientific theology, in the truest sense of the word, and ecclesiastical authority are incompatible.

The suggestion in no. 6 has in it much that is admirable. The Divinity School of the University of Chicago, like some other seminaries, is already an interdenominational institution with every sort of denominational affiliation among its students and a number of denominations represented on the faculty. If, in the first paragraph, "denominational schools" means "denominational colleges" rather than theological seminaries, I think it would be safe to say that a very large number of them already meet the requirements. Only the most narrowly ecclesiastical schools and colleges set denominational limitations for the members of their faculties. A large number of denominational colleges have already changed into non-denominational schools — at least in form.

Chicago, Ill.

SHAILER MATHEWS,
Dean of the Divinity School, University of Chicago.

Important Thing Is the Spirit and Ability of the Men Who Compose Both Faculty and Trustees

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I do not regard it as a matter of serious consequence whether a denominational theological seminary has on its faculty members of other denominations or not. Nor do I regard it as of special importance whether its board of trustees is made up of men from different denominations. The one important thing is the spirit and ability of the men who compose both the faculty and the board of trustees. Every denominational seminary should be so broad-minded and catholic in spirit that it would hardly be aware of the fact if a member of another denomination should enter its faculty. And this, I believe, is true of most of the leading theological seminaries of the country. The institution with which I am connected had for many years on its faculty men of only one denomination, but for ten or fifteen years past two or three other denominations have been represented from time to time on its teaching staff. The change was made without anyone's taking notice of it, and in and of itself it has, so far as I can see, brought neither gain nor loss to the institution. Each man has made his contribution to the school regardless of his denominational affiliations. The idea that a faculty is necessarily narrow and one-sided in its conception of

Christianity, if all its members happen to belong to a single denomination, is entirely mistaken. Denominationalism plays a very small part in the intellectual life of the average teacher of theology.

In general I approve of the suggestions in finding six, but their immediate practical significance I do not rate very high. In the present confused condition of church life in America there is a place for both the denominational and undenominational school of theology. Which performs the more important function, it would be futile to ask. The test of every institution must be found, not in abstract considerations, but in life, and life still seems to give the larger place to the broad-minded and catholic-spirited denominational seminary.

Boston, Mass.

ALBERT C. KNUDSON,
Dean of the School of Theology, Boston University.

Realized in the Congregational Seminary of Chicago

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: The Chicago Theological Seminary is governed by a board of directors chosen by a convention of Congregational churches in sixteen states of the Middle West. It was founded in 1855. Its charter specifically stated that "the institution shall be equally open to all denominations of Christians." This applied to men and women. Members of the board must be members of an evangelical church. No restrictions regarding denominational relationships are laid on the faculty. In its affiliation with the University of Chicago the widest of association between representatives of all denominations is guaranteed to both faculty and students. Thus the conditions outlined in finding no. 6 are practically realized in this Congregational seminary. Personally I am committed to the position of divinity schools which shall be responsible to their respective denominations. I would not desire to see the Chicago Theological Seminary otherwise related. I believe we have achieved almost an ideal expression of interdenominational freedom of action within denominational relationships. Specific courses in Christian unity are hardly called for where the whole temper of the institution is such as that described above.

Chicago, Ill.

OZORA S. DAVIS,
Dean of the Congregational Theological Seminary.

Baltimore Conference Was Violative of Freedom in Conscience

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I believe the whole conception of Christian unity advocated in the Baltimore Conference is contrary to the essential and fundamental prin-

ciples of Christianity, and can lead only to some such ecclesiastical corporation as the Roman Catholic Church now embodies. I believe it is violative of freedom in conscience and independence of the church organization, and can result in nothing but disaster. For genuine spiritual unity, I have the greatest desire. For whatever form of coöperation may be possible without violation of Christian liberty, I am heartily in sympathy, but organic union is the very antithesis of the original spirit of Christianity.

Jackson, Miss.

P. I. LIPSEY,
Editor of *The Baptist Record*.

Questionable Procedure

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: Much of the smoke from modern day controversy would be got rid of and the controversy itself prevented if representative scholars of the different churches could unite in putting in accessible form the accredited results of Bible interpretation and historical study, and if, after it had been done, the controversialists could be induced to read these accredited results.

Re no. 6: The recommendation that denominational schools put on their board of trustees persons of other denominations until the school shall at last be controlled by several denominations instead of one, is questionable. These monies were probably given by people who, in most cases, would have withheld them if they had believed the time would come when control would be yielded to others. Therefore the question would arise as to whether or not the boards of trustees had not violated their trust. A better recommendation, it seems to me, would have been to urge opening of the way for other people to invest in these institutions, and, in proportion to their investment, let them have a voice in the control of the schools. In that way there would come the fuller Christian interpretation sought, without the violation of trust or the justifiable charge of the wrong use of funds.

There is no question in my mind but that if the training for the ministry is continued in denominational seminaries, each isolated from the seminaries of other denominations, the results will be "hot-house" products unsuited to the cosmopolitan trends of modern times. A much more virile ministry will be developed and one alert to the issues of the day if the ministers can be trained in union seminaries, where they are in contact during their training with other university and professional schools, making for a cosmopolitan spirit and outlook.

Columbia, Mo.

G. D. EDWARDS,
Dean of the Bible College of Missouri,
University of Missouri.

A Step in the Right Direction

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: The resolution passed by the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference is a step in the right direction. The day of the strictly denominational school, while not past, is passing, as it ought to do. This resolution would hasten the process.

Winter Park, Fla.

HAMILTON HOLT,
President of Rollins College.

Heartily Approves

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I heartily approve of the findings of the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference. Congratulations on this splendid work.

Whittier, Calif.

WALTER F. DEXTER,
President of Whittier College.

Baltimore Conference Struck the Right Note

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: Christian unity is becoming something more than an idle dream. Though it was an ideal in the mind and heart of Jesus, division rather than unity has characterized the body of Christ throughout the centuries. But in recent years there has come a decided change in attitude. The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America is just twenty years old, and it is impossible to overestimate its contribution toward better understanding and closer coöperation. The Conference on Life and Work, held in Stockholm in 1925, and the Conference on Faith and Order, held in Lausanne in 1927, have brought together Christian leaders from practically all parts of the world. Whatever may be the immediate outcome, these conferences mark a definite step in the right direction.

Less has been said in the public press about the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference, and yet, at least so far as meaning for the Church in America is concerned, it ranks in significance alongside of the other gatherings mentioned. With 650 persons enrolled in the day sessions, representing 25 communions and coming from 11 states and Canada—who can estimate the unifying influences proceeding from such a meeting? To the present writer it seems that the conference struck the right note: "Not in theories nor in compromises, nor in proselytism, but in the atmosphere of the Lord's Supper we are to find our lost brotherhood." There is every reason for encouragement and optimism in a conference like this.

Evanston, Ill.

FREDERICK CARL EISELEN,
President of Garrett Biblical Institute.

A Rationale Free From Bigotry and Intolerance

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: The findings of the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference are very interesting indeed. I can quite understand why finding no. 6 was not passed by the committee but on the floor of the conference. As a matter of fact, the bringing in of teachers from other denominations has become so common in denominational schools that at the present momentum it is likely to increase without any exterior pressure. I, myself, fully approve of the course in Christian unity that you suggest under no. 6 and I am quite certain that what is suggested under no. 3 would mean much in the successful unifying of the work of organized Christianity. Our best men must give themselves to the creation of a rationale which will be free from the bigotry and intolerance of the past and which will make for orderly progress toward a much desired unanimity of both faith and order. This unanimity can only come by a series of consents on the part of those involved and these consents must be in the fullest sense intelligent.

Hamilton, N. Y.

THOMAS WEARING,
Dean of Colgate University.

Denominational Colleges Active Agents in Fostering Division

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I have read the last *Quarterly* carefully and am altogether in sympathy with the findings of the conference. I am especially pleased with the resolution concerning denominational colleges, as I have long believed that such colleges are active agents in the fostering of division.

Cleveland, Ohio.

F. H. GROOM,
Minister of Franklin Circle Christian Church.

Time Not Ripe for Such a Revolutionary Proposal

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I have read the findings of the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference with delight and interest. It is a pleasure to read a document that is replete with the spirit of brotherhood in Christ and of the sweet charity of toleration in matters of faith and practice. As one who has devoted his life to theological education, I was naturally interested in findings three and six, which deal with the historical study of Christian creeds and institutions, and theological training. The suggestions and recommendations of these two articles of the findings are, in my judgment, worthy of serious consideration, if we are really interested in Christian unity. A representative commission of scholars who enjoy the confidence of their respective

communions would come to a pretty close consensus of opinion as to the interpretation of crucial passages of Scripture, and the origin of Christian institutions. When the group consciousness of the Church fully realizes the fate of such a consensus of opinion, the death knell of sectarianism will be sounded.

The suggestion of finding six as to the personnel of the teaching staff of theological institutions is ideal and would effectively break down denominational barriers. But the time is scarcely ripe for what would seem a revolutionary proposal to many churchmen. In my opinion it would be very difficult, in many instances, to secure the legal changes which would make it possible to carry out these recommendations. In the case of some institutions that I know, the proposals would not come within the range of practicality. A great deal of water will have to flow under the ecclesiastical bridge before the end sought by the proponents of finding 6 will be attained.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

JAMES A. KELSO,

President of Western Theological Seminary.

P.S.—On May 13th, at the regular evening service in the First Baptist Church of Pittsburgh, a young man, Mr. T. E. Miller, recently graduated from our institution, was ordained to the Baptist ministry. The charge to him was delivered by Rev. Hugh T. Kerr, D.D., pastor of the Shadyside Presbyterian Church, the sermon was preached by the minister of the church, Rev. C. Wallace Petty, D.D., LL.D., and I had the privilege of making the ordination prayer; the address of welcome to the fellowship of the ministry was given by Rev. Elkanah Hulley, LL.D., Past President of Broadus College — two Presbyterian ministers taking part in an ordination service of a Baptist Church. I think you will have to go far to find a finer exhibition of Christian brotherhood and fellowship.

JAMES A. KELSO.

Should Awaken Much Thought

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: In the findings of the Baltimore Conference on Christian Unity there are some things that should awaken much thought. All of us need to ponder the statement that the formulas of the churches were necessarily fashioned by the science and philosophy of the age in which the creeds were written. A creed of the fourth century necessarily assumes that the globe on which we live is the center of the universe, and that the ascension of our Lord was "up" to a flat sky above us. It assumes that God is an absolute monarch and that angels literally have wings. So in the sixteenth century a creed must assume that creation was in six days of twenty-four hours each. Have not our creeds to-day the same sort of limitation? Also we need to be reminded that denominational schools should be Christian — should be

as broad as the mind of Christ. Every theological student should constantly be reminded of Christ's great saying: "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold."

Providence, R. I.

W. H. P. FAUNCE,
President of Brown University.

Ultimate Denominational Self-Effacement

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: As a teacher of church government for twenty-three years, I have gradually become convinced that the question of "order" (faith and order) is the first one to be determined in all efforts for church unity. So far as I can see, there never can be church unity among the Protestant bodies so long as the doctrine of the necessity of apostolic succession is held by any one of them. The first question, therefore, formally to be answered by any such body is, "Do you still propose to adhere to the doctrine of apostolic succession, with its corollaries — which limits the valid administration of the sacraments to those in such apostolic succession? If the answer is No, then there is a possibility of unity; if the answer is Yes, then there is no possibility whatever of unity. Here lies the crux of the situation, and it is both wise and kind to rest further procedure until that question is authoritatively answered.

As to denominational theological schools, I believe that they should, at least in the Presbyterian Church U. S. A., continue as denominational schools, infused with the spirit of friendly and helpful coöperation both for home and for foreign fields, acknowledging the orders of other evangelical bodies and developing a spirit that makes them exist and grow, not for denominational ends, but definitely and preëminently for the contribution they can render, if necessary by ultimate denominational self-effacement, to the good of the universal Church.

Chicago, Ill.

JAMES G. K. MCCLURE,
President of McCormick Theological Seminary.

A United Protestantism or a Dark Future

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I have read with interest the findings of the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference. I am greatly interested in them. This matter of unity is in my opinion one of the most vital issues before us at the present time. If we cannot get rid of our dissensions and come together as a united Protestantism the future looks dark.

Carthage, Mo.

WM. WIRT KING,
President of Ozark Wesleyan College.

Was Keenly Interested

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I was keenly interested in the Baltimore Conference, for it seems very clear to me that in the present state of affairs men of broad Christian sympathies and of interdenominational good will, who are outstanding religious leaders must get together and give the gesture of Christian unity. It must be done in the present day by the free and voluntary movements of Christian leaders actually partaking of the sacrament together, exchanging pulpits with one another, and joining in a very real way in all the great common interests of Christianity. Such gestures are easily appreciated by the great body of Christian people in every church, who have in fact the spirit of Christian unity, but have no easy way of expressing it through the present denominational agencies. Of course I always assume that unity will never mean uniformity, and that one way of strengthening the Church general is to encourage the motives and strengthen the activities of the particular church denominations. This, too, I find to be the spirit of the Baltimore Conference.

Ripon, Wis.

SILAS EVANS,
President of Ripon College.

Ready for Reasonable Submersion of Denominationalism

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I have a feeling that the emphasis upon denominationalism on any mission field is a mistake, if not a sin, and must be confusing to the natives. There must be, however, some denominational recognition in the holding of property, but this need not be extended beyond the material side of the work. I am also ready for any reasonable submersion of denominationalism on the home field.

Lowell, Mass.

JOHN T. ULLOM,
President of the Primitive Methodist Foreign
Missionary Board.

Reformed Church in Accord With the Findings

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: The Reformed Church in the United States does not magnify denominational differences at home and on the foreign field. She has minimized them almost to the vanishing point, and is therefore in full accord with the findings of the Baltimore Unity Conference on this subject.

Our missions in Japan and China work in close coöperation with other denominations, and in fact have no separate denominational existence, and

our latest mission work in Bagdad is under the direction of a joint committee of three foreign mission boards in this country. Until organic union has been fully established there could be no closer form of coöperation than this. To transport to the foreign field the divisions of the home church, which for the most part have had historical justification or, at least, historical inevitability, has always seemed to us nothing short of tragical. The missionaries of our denomination are all imbued with this spirit of unity and coöperation, and, for the most part, they have found no difficulty in adjusting their thinking and their activities to its demands. Our church is committed by its traditional spirit and conduct to the principle of unity and coöperation in prosecuting the work of the Kingdom of God.

Reading, Pa.

CHARLES E. CREITZ,
President of the Board of Foreign Missions,
Reformed Church in the U. S.

Concurs Heartily in Recommendations

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I concur heartily in the recommendations. Am glad your committee consistently uses the word *unity* without the implication of *uniformity*.

Granville, Ohio.

FRED G. BOUGHTON,
Formerly President of Sioux Falls College.

Christ Prayed For It

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I have read the findings of the Baltimore Conference with interest and I favor every real step toward Christian union. Sectarianism hinders the progress of the Kingdom. The findings of the conference will help. They are on the right track. It will all take time, but Christ prayed for it and it will come. Christian unity is more than comity; more than consolidation for financial reasons; something entirely different than an economic measure. It is a matter of love, fellowship, spirituality, and real union.

Dayton, Ohio.

WARREN H. DENISON,
Secretary of the General Convention of the Christian Church.

Hesitates on Organic Unity

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I have enjoyed very much reading the findings of the Baltimore Conference. I am unable thoroughly to share the opinion that Christianity

cannot do its work in the world without organic union of the churches. I am thoroughly in sympathy with more unity of spirit and unity of action; but I believe that the idea of organic unity is a long way ahead of us. It is my judgment that the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America has achieved vastly more than some people have been willing to give it credit for, and I see no reason why it should not yet be a larger servant of the Protestant churches than it has been.

Your idea of a common church press and a common church theological seminary and a common church college is a thing which I believe is not of supreme importance, and I certainly think it is something that we will not soon be able to achieve. But let me say that I appreciate from my heart any effort that is being put forth to bring us to more of a unit in the understanding of our task and the understanding of one another.

Austin, Texas.

THOMAS W. CURRIE,
President of Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary.

Thoroughly Endorses It

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I am in hearty sympathy with the Christian Unity League movement and thoroughly endorse it. I wish I might be of some use in promoting the cause of Christian unity.

Marietta, Ohio.

EDWARD S. PARSONS,
President of Marietta College.

In Full Accord With the Spirit of the Findings

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I have read the findings in *The Quarterly* with very much interest and wish to assure you that I am in the fullest accord with the spirit of the paper. I think it is an admirable statement of the position which many thousands take in the various denominations. This work is bound to bring results in the future and I trust that our fondest hopes may be realized.

Le Mars, Iowa.

C. A. MOCK,
President of Western Union College.

The Next Step Is to Urge the Union of Denominational Colleges

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I note with great delight article no. 6 in the findings of the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference that deals with denominational colleges.

I feel the situation there suggested obtains more widely to-day than is generally known. Transylvania College has representatives of other denominations both upon its faculty and its governing board. I feel the next step to be urged is a union of denominational colleges where they are in competitive territory. This would minimize our denominational differences, maximize our agreements, and give undenominational motivation and undenominational objectives.

Wherever a church college is in competition with a tax supported institution it almost invariably happens that the church that supports the college has more youth in the tax supported institution than in its own church college. If the Church is interested in life it must seriously consider affiliation of its educational program with the tax supported institution that the Church may get out of competitive academics and center its program in pure religious education.

Lexington, Ky.

A. D. HARMON,
President of Transylvania College.

Along the Right Lines

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I read the findings of the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference with real interest and am greatly pleased with the declaration. It seems to me that it is along the right lines. I shall welcome the inclusion in the faculty of Yankton College those who are not Congregationalists as well as those who are. I believe you will find that Congregationalists are as ready as any of the churches to subordinate denominationalism in the broad general interest of Christian work.

Yankton, S. D.

G. W. NASH,
President of Yankton College.

Point Toward Greater Unity

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I believe that the findings show good judgment in pointing out a line along which greater unity may be achieved. The Friends do not maintain a seminary, but send their prospective ministers to those seminaries which show the broadest sympathies. As we do not observe, in an outward way, the ordinances, our interdenominational fellowship is, therefore, quite cordial. While the founders of Guilford College had certain high standards for spiritual interpretations of the Christian message, these interpretations are not limited to Friends, and we can, quite frequently, find teachers who

have a sympathetic view-point with them. We are always glad to consider such teachers for positions on our faculty.

Guilford College, N. C.

RAYMOND BINFORD,
President of Guilford College.

Approaches Must Be Cautious

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I gladly express my approval of the findings of the Baltimore Conference. Of course such approaches must be cautious. The expression of the findings seem to me wise and constructive.

Lewisburg, Pa.

EMORY W. HUNT,
President of Bucknell University.

Things Gradually Changing Toward Interdenominationalism

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I have just read with interest the findings of the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference and wish to express my hearty accord with all of the principles stated therein. However, we must realize that, things being as they are, we have to try to possess our souls in patience and not attempt to jump toward the ideal. We must go step by step. For instance, I must agree that the denominational press may become and is becoming more interdenominational. At the same time I find myself under the necessity of publishing a *denominational* paper. Of course I try to give it a reasonably broad outlook and, considering my handicaps, I think I succeed in some measure. Nevertheless, while we still have denominations, we seem compelled to have denominational journals. While such is the case is it not better to have some of them with a broader outlook than to leave the field to the sectarian kind of journals? Things are gradually changing toward interdenominationalism, and I seek to do all that can wisely be done to encourage the trend. Yet, while the process is going on we must do many things in a more or less denominational way — especially when there are still so many people who think that their own particular kind of church is the only right kind of a church.

Nashville, Tenn.

JAS. E. CLARKE,
Editor of *The Presbyterian Advance*.

Will Be Glad to Cooperate

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I read the findings of the Baltimore Conference and I think that your committee has shown very fine and balanced judgment in the utterance

it has made. I believe that approach toward Christian unity is the only wise, in fact, the only useful, one. It is upon such lines as this that we can make real progress.

Personally, I was not disappointed with the Lausanne Conference. I have heard addresses by Dr. H. F. Swartz of the Pacific School of Religion, Mr. F. A. Horne of New York, and Bishop McConnell, as well as Bishop Parsons of the San Francisco diocese of the Protestant Episcopal Church. My own impression was that the gathering was in itself a great achievement. The fact that men, who are actually doing the work of the Church, got to a place where they could really figure out the points in agreement and disagreement was a matter of such great importance that we have occasion to thank God and take courage.

The California Christian Advocate will be glad to coöperate in every way along the lines that you have laid out.

San Francisco, Calif.

EDWARD P. DENNETT,

Editor of *The California Christian Advocate*.

More Christian Unity on the Foreign Fields Than in the Homelands

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: During the last century one of the most familiar criticisms of the foreign missionary enterprise was the folly of establishing, in the Orient, churches which represented and embodied denominational differences due to historic developments in the churches of the Western world. This criticism was only partly justified, for, inasmuch as the Western churches were divided, how else could evangelization be begun than along denominational lines? At present, however, there is far more Christian comity, coöperation, and union on the foreign fields than in our homelands. Japan, India, Korea, and China have all given notable examples of what can be done in the way of true Christian unity by the apportionment of territory, by conducting union institutions, and by combining churches of nationals which formerly represented separated groups and denominations. This spirit of Christian unity must be nurtured on the foreign field, and the example of these infant churches must be used as an inspiration and encouragement to the mother churches of the West.

Princeton, N. J.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN,

Princeton Theological Seminary.

Favors Christian Unity

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I am wholly in favor of Christian unity, but I fear we shall not succeed in getting it until we have succeeded in *de-commercializing* Chris-

tianity, or refuse to regard it as an institution for propaganda. This is the criticism directed against Christianity by the Oriental peoples. The Christian religion is one thing, and the system of Christian dogma quite another, and until we separate the two, I fear much of our labor for unity will be in vain.

I am not a clergyman, although I prepared for the ministry and graduated from a theological school.

Decatur, Ill.

MARK E. PENNEY,
President of Millikin University.

Cannot Agree With Findings

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: In order that you may see what fundamental differences there are on this subject of Christian unity, I must frankly tell you that I cannot agree with the fundamental proposition stated in the Baltimore Conference, namely, "that, if the prayer of our Lord is to be fulfilled, the unity of all His disciples must be visibly expressed." I belong to a church which declares in its principal creed that "to the true unity of the Church it is enough to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments." I heartily concur with this statement. Not agreeing with the basical proposition of the findings, it is evident that I cannot agree with the inferences drawn from it.

Columbia, S. C.

A. G. VOIGT,
Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary.

What Would You Have Left?

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: For one thing I see that much is said about some form of visible expression of the oneness of the Church in the Baltimore Conference findings. Certainly visible union would be desirable, or at least we think it would be. Possibly if we had it we might find that it is not so desirable after all. I am sure it would not be if the outward union would have to be secured at the sacrifice of some vital elements of truth. What we need far more than the outward expression of union is the inner unity of faith. If we had that the securing of some expression of unity, in outward form, would be an easy matter. Just to-day I worked out the Sunday-school lesson where Paul reproves the Corinthian Christians for their contentions and admonishes them to "be perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment." That is the kind of union we need and until we get that I very much fear any outward union would not hold.

You also advise breaking down denominational lines or fences. For example, that every denominational school should have men of other denominations on its faculty, and that denominational papers should have contributions from other denominations. I think that would go far toward breaking down the fences. Different herds would soon mix up. But the question in my mind is, What would you have left? If you could in that way get them all to think the same thing and the right thing, then that would seem to be the thing to do. But would that be the outcome? I fear not. Of course, I see that there are denominational doctrines or distinctions that could be discarded. They might have been discarded to advantage long ago. But that is hardly true of all denominational distinctions. The leveling process could therefore easily go too far. Especially would that be the case if Modernists, with their radical departure from Bible truth, were to be taken in. I very much fear that after the needed level was reached there would be little left for a poor sinner to build any hope of salvation on.

Columbus, Ohio.

J. SHEATSLEY,
Editor of *Lutheran Standard*.

Heartily in Sympathy With the Ideals

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I am heartily in sympathy with the ideals of the Baltimore Conference and trust that much further progress can be made in the same direction.

Birmingham, Ala.

GUY E. SNAVELY,
President of Birmingham-Southern College.

In Desiring and Praying for Unity We Are One

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I have read the findings of the Baltimore Conference and in the main agree with what it presents there. Of course many things in the findings will be far more easy for the family of the Reformed churches to accept than the Lutheran, but in the spirit of desiring, praying, and working for Christian unity we are one.

Ithaca, N. Y.

WILLIAM M. HORN,
Pastor Lutheran Church.

Yearning for Real Brotherhood

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I think the statement defining the attitude and function of the various denominational groups strikes deep into the needs of to-day and that

the yearning for a more real brotherhood expressed in the findings is a rapidly spreading desire of many earnest Christians. I am with you.

Adrian, Mich.

HARLAN L. FEEMAN,
President of Adrian College.

Dickinson College Attained the Purpose Suggested in the Findings

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: With respect to denominational colleges, referred to in the findings of the Baltimore Conference, I would say that Dickinson College, while under the auspices of the Methodist Church for nearly one hundred years, came under such auspices without any change of charter and has never been bound to the church by any charter provisions. In other words, though the transfer was made in 1833, when denominational controversies were rife, those who took it over accepted the charter of an absolutely undenominational institution, and it has so continued through the years. The conduct of the college has been in harmony with this, and throughout the years its board of trustees has been composite. It has representatives of the Methodist Church, but representatives also from other sister denominations. Its faculty likewise has members of various denominations, and seems to me in many ways to have attained largely the purpose suggested in number 6 of your findings.

Carlisle, Pa.

J. H. MORGAN,
President of Dickinson College.

Excellent Basis for Discussion

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I am moved to express to you my feeling that the several points are clearly stated and form an excellent basis for the discussion. It is not so much a question of what direction our churches shall take as it is how fast they can go in that direction without doing violence to the individual Christian conscience. The movement is on and it should be kept constantly before the best minds of our several denominations. Some day a miracle will happen and pride of opinion will give place to the spirit of selflessness in the performance of Christ's program for His Kingdom on earth. Strong leadership will have to move forward with that same spirit of patience and tolerance which will be one of the marks of the order at which we are aiming. I think there is more of a disposition to discuss these matters than ever before and a leadership is developing in all of our denominations which will make itself more vocal in the future. You and I may not live to see even an approximation of that spirit of Christian unity in which we believe,

but it is bound to come. What matter if it takes a hundred years or more, so long as its great moment does arise in due time.

Salem, Va.

CHAS. J. SMITH,
President of Roanoke College.

Fears Power of One Denomination

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I was pleased to read the findings of the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference. The downfall of the interchurch movement was a disappointment to me. I believe in Christian unity. At present I am not convinced that it is altogether wise to have but one denomination. I fear the power that would come to a single church organization among the Protestants of this country. Christian unity among the benevolent organizations of the various denominations would be a great step forward. By such unity I am sure we could do a far greater service at less expense than is now being done by the denominations separately. Please do not understand me to be opposed to union. I am open to conviction.

Bucksport, Maine.

RALPH E. PECK,
Headmaster of East Maine Conference Seminary.

Heartily Concurs in the Spirit of the Conference

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I heartily concur in the general spirit and purpose of the Baltimore Conference. While believing in the place of the individual denomination in the Kingdom of God, at the present time I am thoroughly convinced that the branches of various denominations should as speedily as possible effect a coördination or a unification which will enable each denomination to present a solid front to the problems of evil and ignorance that are in the world. I also believe that there should be a greater comity among the several denominations.

Macon, Ga.

WM. F. QUILLIAN,
President of Wesleyan College.

Visible Union Now Seems Impossible

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I have read finding five of the Baltimore Conference with a great deal of satisfaction. Since a visible union of all Christian communions and forces seems impossible at this time here in the homeland, it can certainly

be achieved in foreign lands, if the denominational boards are willing and ready to scrap their doctrinal men-of-war and, shod only with the "stability of the gospel of peace," show themselves favorable to the organization of native churches that are based purely on personal devotion to Jesus Christ and on loving fellowship with one another. Let those who are turning to Christ in Eastern lands begin where Peter and John and Paul began, when they became conscious of the truth: "The foundation is laid, namely, Jesus Christ, and no one can lay another." What right have we to add our own wood, hay, and stubble, even though in our not always properly focused eyes they may look like gold, silver, and precious stones, as a necessary integral part of this divine foundation? If, then, in later years, as is not unlikely, denominationalism should crop up there also, like tares among the wheat, it will at least happen without our doing, and we of present-day missionary endeavor shall not be to blame.

Steubenville, O.

C. W. LOCHER,

Chairman of the Foreign Mission Board of the
Evangelical Synod of N. A.

In Accord With the Spirit and Purpose of the Findings

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: My attitude toward "organic unity" has considerably changed since a conference in New York of students and other representatives of Middle Atlantic theological seminaries. Such unity, in my judgment, is in the very distant future. But beginnings might be made and, it seems to me, ought to be made, that would go beyond coöperation, however important that may be. For instance, I think that fifteen or sixteen branches of the Methodist, and ten or twelve branches of the Baptist, or Presbyterian Churches, might well make haste to come together in some unity that might well be called organic. As I think you know, I make a pretty broad distinction between denominationalism and sectarianism. In politics, economics, philosophy, science, religion, etc., there are divisions that might be reasonably called denominations. These divisions represent serious and intelligent thinking and such differences are likely to continue long. But you will permit me to say, I am sure, that I am intensely opposed to sectarianism. I am not necessarily a sectarian because I believe in the observance of a particular day and in a particular mode of baptism. I become a sectarian when I refuse fraternal and Christian fellowship to those who may honestly differ. I am not, therefore, very much afraid of the word denomination. I wish, however, to say that I am in complete accord with the general spirit and purpose of the findings of the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference.

Alfred, N. Y.

ARTHUR E. MAIN,
Dean of Alfred University.

Can Support All Its Points

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I read *The Christian Union Quarterly* for April, 1928, and feel that I can support all the points of the Baltimore Conference. The Mennonite Church, however, has not had any participation in the World Conference on Faith and Order. Our church, however, could profit by the spirit and expression of the Baltimore Conference of the Christian Unity League, if they could put into practice the principles there announced.

Bluffton, Ohio.

S. K. MOSIMAN,
President of Bluffton College.

Christian Nationals Are Ready for Unity

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: All that Christian nationals of other lands know of denominationalism has come to them from denominational missionaries. Such teaching has invariably tended to confuse rather than clarify the Christian message in the minds of these nationals. They cannot understand the divisions of the Western churches. They question the traditions and dogmas which have nothing to do with their personal relationship to Christ. They beg us of the West to bring to them simply Christ, and let Him work His will in their lives. And they are keenly aware that when Christ has His way with them they will be one in Him. Leading missionaries are beginning to see the folly of a divided Church on the mission field. They are beginning to realize that if they are ever to win the world for Christ they who profess to follow Him must follow Him together in their task. Instead of encouraging denominationalism these leaders are beginning to encourage the union of Christ's followers overseas. But their number must quickly increase to the end that the National Christian Church may be realized as another step toward the ultimate goal of a World Christian Church. Christian nationals are ready for this step. God grant that our missionaries and the Church at home may also be ready!

Dayton, Ohio.

W. P. MINTON,
Secretary of Foreign Missions of the Christian Church.

We Must Develop a Church That Is Christian

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: The Baltimore Conference of the Christian Unity League has expressed in its fifth finding a truth that is filling rapidly the consciousness of Christianity. We are discovering that our Western Christianity has

taken on a form that is not truly expressive of the religion of Christ. The heart of our religion is sound but its outward expression is greatly deformed. We are two thousand years removed from the fountainhead of Christianity. During these years the outward form of the Church has been affected greatly. Our denominational differences are related only to the historical development of Christianity and none of them are essentially connected with it in its original and truest form.

We must give to the peoples of other lands original Christianity divested of modern perversions. We must avoid transplanting our divisions as noxious weeds in the virgin soil of foreign fields. We must divest ourselves of denominationalism and teach others to avoid like divisions. We must seek to develop throughout the world a Church that is neither sectarian, American, nor foreign, but only Christian.

Anderson, Ind.

A. F. GRAY,

President of the Missionary Board of the Church of God.

Laymen Are More Ready for Unity Than Ministers

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I am particularly pleased with the findings of the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference. The advanced steps shown certainly help very much. I have often wondered why in your program for Christian unity you should not include news and programs of community churches such as are now being conducted in 1500 community churches throughout the United States. As you know, I do not regard the community church movement as the last word in Christian unity at all. But it has shown us this much—that the laymen are more ready for unity than the ministers are and that is what the ministers have been saying for the past twenty-five years.

Park Ridge, Ill.

O. F. JORDAN,

Editor of *The Community Churchman*.

Colleges Are Doing More to Promote Unity Than Any Other Organization

Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*:

Sir: I am much interested in the findings of the Baltimore Christian Unity Conference. Paragraph six interests me especially. My opinion is that the colleges throughout the country are doing more to promote Christian unity, in fact as well as in name, than any other organizations in America. In the main, I approve of all your proposals and wish you good success in promoting them.

Westerville, Ohio.

W. G. CLIPPINGER,

President of Otterbein College.

BOOK REVIEWS

FAITH AND ORDER. Proceedings of the World Conference, Lausanne, August 3-21, 1927. Edited by H. N. Bate, Canon of Carlisle. New York: George H. Doran Company; 534 pages; price, \$2.50.

LAUSANNE 1927. An Interpretation of the World Conference on Faith and Order Held at Lausanne August 3-21, 1927. By Edward S. Woods, M. A., Hon. Canon of Canterbury. With an Introduction by his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. New York: Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc.; 192 pages; price, \$1.25.

LAUSANNE: The Will to Understand. By Edmund Davison Soper, Dean of the School of Religion in Duke University. New York: Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc.; 156 pages; price, \$1.50.

As the year 1910, when the Protestant Episcopal Church in America appointed a commission on a world conference on Faith and Order, was a year of general awakening in Christian unity, so 1927, when the World Conference on Faith and Order was held at Lausanne, was a year of awakening in this subject. Dispatches went out from Lausanne to all parts of the world telling of the conference being a reality. That of itself was a great event. Many newspaper articles have been written by the delegates as have many addresses been made by them, so that Lausanne is as definitely associated with church history as Nicea. Many may not see this now, being so close to it, but the fact that officially appointed delegates assembled from all parts of the world from Eastern Orthodox, Old Catholics, Anglicans, and Protestants, representing about three-fifths of Christendom, was a most significant event. Henceforth the unity of Christendom is an issue in all communions.

As to how fast we will move toward unity is another question, but it will be difficult for any Christian communion to henceforth think of itself in isolation. Even the pope, who did not feel that the Roman Catholic Church could, in justice to its past history, be represented, nevertheless sends an encyclical calling upon Roman Catholics throughout the world not to be carried away by the present day Christian unity discussions.

The churches that were officially represented in the conference were the Anglicans from thirteen countries; Baptists and Seventh Day Baptists from four countries; Brethren from the United States; Christians from the United States; Congregationalists from five countries; Disciples of Christ from three countries; Eastern Orthodox from thirteen countries; Evangelical Churches of Germany, including seven provinces; Friends from two

countries; Lutherans from fourteen countries; Mennonites from Germany; Methodists, including African, United, Primitive, Wesleyan, South, from twelve countries; Moravians from Germany; Old Catholics from two countries; Presbyterians, including United, United Free, Reformed, Evangelical of Bohemia, Waldensians, from twenty-two countries; and United Church of Canada, South India United Church, United Church of Northern India, Protestant Church of Portugal and Czechoslovak Church; in all making fifteen distinct church groups with five miscellaneous and one hundred and eight separate churches.

The work of the conference was well planned. With seventeen years back of it there was ample time to move cautiously so as to set up a conference that would challenge the interest of Christendom. That was done. On its assembling it discussed the call to unity, the Gospel, the nature of the Church, the Church's confession of faith, the ministry, the sacraments, and the unity of Christendom. The volume by Canon Bate is not only a history of the preparatory years but a review of the conference with verbatim reports of the chief addresses, list of the churches represented, and the findings of the conference. Canon Bate has done an extraordinarily fine piece of work and presents the conference most happily.

The two smaller books — one by Canon Woods and the other by Dean Soper — are interpretations — the first as a British Anglican sees it and the other as an American Methodist sees it. Both are engaging volumes. Both necessarily hurry through the conference, touching the high points, but both linger long enough in the conference atmosphere to give fair and satisfactory interpretations. The three books should have a place in every library if one would have a large understanding of Lausanne.

Bishop Brent made the great contribution of his life in his leadership of this conference. His spirit was felt by every member. Too ill to attend, nevertheless he went, although advised by his physician not to go. But for the comprehensive leadership of Dr. A. E. Garvie, the deputy chairman, it is altogether likely that Bishop Brent could not have lived through it. Critically ill for more than six months after the conference, it is an occasion of thanksgiving that he is now recovering, although slowly and, we trust, permanently. We wish he might resign his diocesan work in order to give his whole time to this cause, as Bishop Gore did some years ago to devote his time to the industrial problems.

Lausanne is a beginning in the approaches toward Christian unity. Other conferences will follow it. As free as Lausanne was, other conferences will be freer. Every conference contributes to understanding and out of understanding we grow toward unity. Ignorance is always frost, but understanding is sunshine. Canon Bate, Canon Woods, and Dean Soper have put us under obligation to them for the fine introduction they have given to the World Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne, 1927.

THINKING TOWARD CHRISTIAN UNITY. By John B. Cowden, author of *St. Paul on Christian Unity, Christian Worship*, etc. West Nashville, Tenn.; 202 pages; price, \$1.25.

Aside from the official volumes on the Lausanne Conference, such as those by Canon Bate, Canon Woods, and Dean Soper, which are reviewed on another page, this is the first volume that has voluntarily come out of the Lausanne Conference. There ought to be many more. Mr. Cowden has made a careful study both of the conference and of the whole subject of Christian unity. He might have been selected by his communion as one of its official delegates, for he is well known among the Disciples as an ardent advocate of Christian unity aside from his contribution as an author in this field. He was, however, a coöpted member of the conference and spent much time there in gathering material for his book, which is based on the following quotation from the epistle to the Hebrews: "God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in His Son, . . . who was faithful as a son over His house, whose house we are."

In his study of this text he devotes a chapter each to "God," "His Word," "His Son," "His Creature, Man," and "His Church," the closing chapter being a discussion of the "Retrospect and Prospect of Christian Unity." He argues for the minimum of authority and the maximum of liberty as the basis of Christian unity. He esteems highly the work of Lausanne and regards the chief cleavage to have been between traditionalists and evolutionalists, upon which he says: "Their differences were fundamental and far-reaching; in fact, they seem to have little in common. The one holds to a fixed religion of the past; the other holds to a developing religion of the future. Accordingly, traditional Christianity is the religion of fixed forms; evolutionary Christianity is the religion of growing norms. Traditional Christianity is the religion of restricting authority; evolutionary Christianity is the religion of increasing freedom. Traditional Christianity is the religion of fixed dogmas; evolutionary Christianity is the religion of growing experience." And he concludes that, "unless the traditionalists will agree that religion is partly evolutionary, and the evolutionists will agree that religion is partly traditional, both of which are, we believe, true, there can be no unity between these two parties in the Church."

But he sees the sign of the coming of the Kingdom of God in such a conference as Lausanne, which he regards as having started a tidal wave that will never be turned back until it has swept out individualism, religious differences, misunderstanding, sectarian spirit, and established denominationalism, which he regards as the hardest and last barrier to be removed. The appendix contains the findings of the conference. The book is a thoughtful appeal, indicating a passion for unity, that is so much needed in these times and contending for a change of emphasis from secondary things to

those primary things contained in "God," "His Word," "His Son," "His Creature, Man," and "His Church." It is a calm, fearless approach.

MISS MAYO'S MOTHER INDIA — A REJOINDER. By K. Natarajan, editor *The Indian Social Reformer*. Madras: G. A. Natesan & Co.; 126 pages; price, twelve annas.

A SON OF MOTHER INDIA ANSWERS. By Dhan Gopal Mukerji, author of *My Brother's Face*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.; 112 pages; price, \$1.50.

Both of these books are protests against Miss Katherine Mayo's *Mother India*, which was an unhappy criticism of India, written in newspaper style, with emphasis on the darker side of Indian life. One might write a similar story on the United States, with its great record of crime and its divorce scandal which leads the world. Crime is the largest business in financial output that is done in the United States. Churches insure their offerings from the time they are put on the plate until they are deposited in the bank and, in addition to that, some use armored cars to take the money from the church to the bank because of the prevalence of thievery, but that would be a very one-sided interpretation of the United States and not many in the United States would like for the nation's life to be treated as though that were the only side. As affirmed by Mr. Natarajan, that is not the way of understanding and insight. With fine reserve both of these authors discuss the questions raised by Miss Mayo, which deal with religious, political, and social problems, in an informing style. Mr. Natarajan is himself a courageous social reformer and India is moving gradually toward higher levels. Perhaps a free India might attain it earlier, but in either event it will take time.

OUR FATHERS FAITH AND OURS A Comparison Between Protestantism and Romanism. By David S. Schaff, D. D., lecturer on American Church History in Union Theological Seminary, New York, etc. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons; 680 pages.

The object of this book, as stated by Dr. Schaff, is to state the causes which led to the division of Western Christendom in the sixteenth century and the distinctive differences of its two parts, to trace these differences back to their historical beginnings and to follow them through their development in the Middle Ages and in modern times, and to test them in the light of Scripture, history, and reason.

Dr. Schaff confesses no special zeal for the reunion of Christendom and he sees no good reason why Christianity should not continue upon sepa-

rate ecclesiastical governments, but church history, like secular history, has got to be rewritten. Until it is, the possibilities of a united Christendom will be meager. This is one of the sore spots that must be treated not so much by one church historian apart, but by a group whose approaches have differed.

Nevertheless, as to the origin of the separation of Protestantism and Roman Catholicism, Dr. Schaff has presented a painstaking and scholarly work, sustaining every step in the development by a mass of material that gives to his conclusions remarkable strength for the right of way of Protestantism. It is such a volume as the church historian would revel in, finely written and with due consideration to the weakness of both Protestantism and Roman Catholicism, each a factor in the interpretation of Christianity. It will take its place as a work of merit.

THE STORY OF PHILOSOPHY—Lives and Opinions of the Greater Philosophers. By Will Durant, Ph. D. New York: Simon and Schuster; 589 pages; price, \$5.00.

To be introduced in a single volume to Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Francis Bacon, Spinoza, Voltaire, John Locke, Rousseau, Kant, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Comte, Herbert Spencer, Nietzsche, Bergson, Croce, Bertrand Russell, Santayana, William James, and John Dewey is to command the attention of all who love to think. This of itself is somewhat an explanation for its remarkable sale of more than 200,000 copies to date; but that which has made this volume so fascinating is its "attempt to humanize knowledge by centering the story of speculative thought around certain dominant personalities." Dr. Durant makes them all live again with the charm of their personalities which gave them such a remarkable hold upon the thought of their day and as well as their hold upon the thought of succeeding centuries.

This book has demonstrated a most encouraging fact and that is that in spite of the common superficiality with which we are surrounded it is also a day of deep thinking. If multitudes are greatly concerned about the present, there are other multitudes that are greatly concerned about the past and the future. Dr. Durant has sought to make way for the time when philosophy will be understood as the synthetic interpretation of all experience rather than the analytic description of the mode and process of experience itself. He maintains that philosophy must provide synthesis for wisdom. The story of philosophy is the record of the mind to think clearly and comprehensively about ourselves and the world in which we live. Multitudes are groping for the way. This volume will stand as one of the guideposts to all seekers for truth and for a better understanding of our world. It is a thrilling struggle of reason to meet faith, which it is destined to do in its uplift of the thought of the world toward God.

Christian Unity League

The Christian Unity League was organized at Emmanuel Protestant Episcopal Church and First Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, May 20 and May 31, 1927. It is composed of Christians in all communions who earnestly desire the unity of the followers of Christ. Its constitution and by-laws which are very simple, are as follows:

CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I — NAME

This organization shall be called the Christian Unity League.

ARTICLE II — OBJECT

The object of the Christian Unity League is to form interchurch groups of men and women to pray for the unity of the Church, to practice good will toward all other Christians, and to be open-minded in the search for the paths to the unity of Christendom.

ARTICLE III — MEMBERSHIP

Any person of good Christian character who accepts Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior may be acceptable to membership.

ARTICLE IV — OFFICERS

For local Leagues there shall be a president, two vice-presidents, secretary, and treasurer, and the following committees may be appointed: membership, program, extension, and executive, the latter consisting of the officers and the chairmen of the several committees.

ARTICLE V — DUES

The annual dues shall be one dollar (\$1.00) a year, payable at the beginning of the year. Persons of any church and of any distance from the local League may become members.

BY-LAWS

ARTICLE I — TIME

The League shall meet at the call of the president.

ARTICLE II — ORDER OF MEETING

A period of prayer should either open or close the meeting, or both. Such business as may be necessary may be transacted in the early part of the meeting. Every meeting shall have a definite study period, followed by discussion and prayer.

ARTICLE III — OFFICERS

The officers shall be elected on the organization of the League and shall hold for twelve months, performing the duties common to their offices.

ARTICLE IV — AMENDMENT

These by-laws may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the members present at any meeting, provided notice of such amendment has been given in the announcement of the meeting.

The First Conference of the Christian Unity League was held in Baltimore, January 12 and 13, 1928. The next Conference will be held in Kansas City, Mo., January 16 and 17, 1929; after that, in Chicago, 1930.

PETER AINSLIE, *President*,
Ten Hills, Baltimore, Md.

SAMUEL M. HANN, *Secretary*,
2 Somerset Road, Roland Park,
Baltimore, Md.



The "Supreme Authority"

**WEBSTER'S
NEW INTERNATIONAL
DICTIONARY**

—THE MERRIAM-WEBSTER

Because

Hundreds of Supreme Court Judges concur in highest praise of the work as their *Authority*.

The Presidents of all leading Universities, Colleges, and Normal Schools give their hearty *indorsement*.

All States that have adopted a large dictionary as *standard* have selected Webster's New International.

The Schoolbooks of the Country *adhere* to the Merriam-Webster system of diacritical marks.

The Government Printing Office at Washington uses it as *authority*.

G. & C. MERRIAM COMPANY
SPRINGFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS

Get The Best!

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

The Editor's Notes

The Paris Pact

The Universal Religious Peace Conference

Kansas City Conference

The Protests of Denominationalism to Brotherhood

The Growing Unity of the Church FREDERICK LYNCH

The Proposed Union of the Christian and Congregational
Churches F. G. COFFIN and CHARLES EMERSON BURTON

Progress in Church Union in South India JOHN J. BANNINGA

From Lausanne to Main Street FRED SMITH

Should Churches Unite — Now? ARTHUR JUDSON BROWN

What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity

The San Francisco Conference — American Protestants Getting Together —
Unity by the Way of Spiritual Loyalty — As a Modernist Sees It — As an
Anglo-Catholic Sees It — Christian Reunion as One of the Monks of Unity
Sees It — As an Indian Y. M. C. A. Worker Sees It — Bishop Temple Makes
Bold Proposals — Church Union in Scotland — Union Church at Iowa State
Teachers College — Conference at Mena, Egypt

Book Reviews

The Heights of Christian Unity — The Conversations at Malines — Peace or
War? — The Eternal Spirit in the Daily Round — What is Heresy? — Bap-
tismal Regeneration — Psychological Care of Infant and Child — The Foun-
dations of Nutrition, etc.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Inc.

W. H. HOOVER, President

230 N. FULTON AVE., BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

AGENTS:

Fleming H. Revell Company, New York

Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai

A Statement

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the Unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are free to all indications of Christian Unity and Ventures of Faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all others who accept Jesus as Lord and Savior—are parts of the Church of Christ and that their Equality before God is the paramount issue of modern times.

Such a journal must, necessarily, be unofficial in its attempt to be an Interpreter of the mind of the churches and in furnishing a Forum for better understanding and cordial appreciation between the divided, and sometimes far isolated, communions of Christendom. It, thereby, seeks to contribute something to clear the way to the Altar of Reconciliation.

It does not hold itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors, except in a very general way as to their character and general attitude; but it invites to its pages such contributions of thought as will, on one hand, help in the removal of misunderstandings, and, on the other, create an atmosphere where our differences may be frankly faced and freely discussed in Christian Fellowship.

All contributors are allowed the same freedom in the expression of their thoughts, as the Editor exercises for himself. He does not anticipate that others will always approve his thoughts, any more than he presumes to assume responsibility for the thoughts of others; but every writer is responsible for what appears above his own name. We are to be free to think and equally free to let think, until, in corporate thinking and corporate praying, we find the Road to Brotherhood.

Consequently, this journal is not only not the organ of any party in Christendom; but, likewise, it is not the exponent of any theory of Christian Unity. It follows the reality in personal experience of spiritual growth in Christ—growing up in Him and toward other Christians as we find the Truth, which shall free us from suspicion, prejudice, pride, and unlove. Then we shall be able to interpret Christ in those terms which He expressed in His own words,—“By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have Love one to another.”

CONTENTS

OCTOBER, 1928

VOL. XVIII.

No. 2.

<i>THE EDITOR'S NOTES</i>	99
<i>THE PARIS PACT</i>	103
<i>THE UNIVERSAL RELIGIOUS PEACE CONFERENCE</i>	103
<i>KANSAS CITY CONFERENCE</i>	105
<i>THE PROTESTS OF DENOMINATIONALISM TO BROTHERHOOD</i>	106
<i>THE GROWING UNITY OF THE CHURCH</i>	FREDERICK LYNCH 112
<i>THE PROPOSED UNION OF THE CHRISTIAN AND CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES</i>	
.....F. G. COFFIN AND CHARLES EMERSON BURTON	119
<i>PROGRESS IN CHURCH UNION IN SOUTH INDIA</i>	JOHN J. BANNINGA 128
<i>FROM LAUSANNE TO MAIN STREET</i> ...	FRED SMITH 134
<i>SHOULD CHURCHES UNITE — NOW?</i>	ARTHUR JUDSON BROWN 139
<i>WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY</i>	150
<i>BOOK REVIEWS</i>	172

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

230 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES:—THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is open to contributions from all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all other Christians who accept Jesus as Lord and Saviour. It is entirely immaterial whether these contributions agree or disagree with the Editor's position, or the position of any contributor. We are seeking to bring together those who differ, for unless we frankly face our differences, and think them through, we shall never agree. THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY welcomes to its Forum all Ministers of Reconciliation.

PRICE:—The price of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, published in January, April, July, and October, is seventy-five cents a single copy, or two dollars and fifty cents a year, in the United States and all parts of the world. A local church of any communion contributing annually \$5.00 or more to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY EXTENSION FUND will be entitled to receive two copies of THE QUARTERLY free for one year—one copy going to the minister and the other copy to some designated person or institution.

Entered as second-class matter October 18th, 1923, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., U.S.A., under the Act of Congress of March 3rd, 1879.

The Christian Union Quarterly

EDITOR

PETER AINSLIE, D.D., Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FREDERICK LYNCH, D.D., Educational Secretary Church Peace Union, New York, and BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, JR., D.D., Rector St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, Richmond, Va.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

- | | |
|---|---|
| DR. HAMILCAR ALIVISATOS,
Athens, Greece. | PROF. RUFUS M. JONES,
Haverford, Pa. |
| BISHOP CHARLES P. ANDERSON,
Chicago, Ill. | REV. SAMUEL MCCOMB, D.D.,
Dresden, Germany. |
| REV. NEHEMIAH BOYNTON, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. | BISHOP FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL,
New York, N. Y. |
| BISHOP CHARLES H. BRENT,
Buffalo, N. Y. | BISHOP WILLIAM F. MCDOWELL,
Washington, D.C. |
| DEAN CHARLES R. BROWN,
New Haven, Conn. | REV. WILLIAM P. MERRILL, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. |
| PROF. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN,
New York, N. Y. | DR. WILFRED MONOD,
Paris, France. |
| REV. RAYMOND CALKINS, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass. | DR. C. C. MORRISON,
Chicago, Ill. |
| BISHOP JAMES CANNON, JR.,
Washington, D. C. | DR. JOHN R. MOTT,
New York, N. Y. |
| PROF. DR. J. EUGENE CHOISY,
Geneva, Switzerland. | BISHOP HARALD OSTENFELD,
Copenhagen, Denmark. |
| REV. S. D. CHOWN, D.D.,
Toronto, Canada. | BISHOP EDWARD L. PARSONS,
San Francisco, Calif. |
| DR. J. A. CRAMER,
Utrecht, Holland. | PROF. ARTHUR S. PEAKE,
Manchester, England. |
| PROF. DR. ADOLF DEISSMANN,
Berlin, Germany. | PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS,
Lancaster, Pa. |
| REV. A. W. FORTUNE, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky. | PRINCIPAL W. B. SELBIE,
Oxford, England. |
| DEAN H. E. W. FOSBROKE,
New York, N. Y. | PASTOR DR. FRIEDRICH SIEGMUND-
SCHULTZE,
Berlin, Germany. |
| DEAN W. E. GARRISON,
Chicago, Ill. | DR. ROBERT E. SPEER,
New York, N. Y. |
| PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE,
London, England. | THE ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA,
Upsala, Sweden. |
| MOST REV. METROPOLITAN GERMANOS,
Thyatira, Asia Minor. | DR. HENRY VAN DYKE,
Princeton, N. J. |
| PRESIDENT W. A. HARPER,
Elon College, N. C. | REV. JOSEPH A. VANCE, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich. |
| DR. HENRY T. HODGKIN,
Shanghai, China. | BISHOP BOYD VINCENT,
Cincinnati, Ohio. |
| REV. FINIS S. IDLEMAN, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. | THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK,
York, England. |
| DEAN W. R. INGE,
London, England. | |

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

OCTOBER, 1928

THE EDITOR'S NOTES

In the passing of Bishop Luther B. Wilson, Methodist Episcopal bishop of New York, we lose another from our Editorial Council. Bishop Wilson was alive to the needs of the unity of the church. We have always listened with interest to his advocacy of this cause. He was active in the work of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and in everything that made for better understanding among Christians. He held a fine and large grasp of modern problems and threw himself with his fine spirit into their causes.

The twentieth anniversary of the establishment of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America will be celebrated on the occasion of its quadrennial meeting in Rochester, N. Y., December 5-12. Those of us who were with the Federal Council in its beginning and have seen it grow in a remarkable service of unifying American Protestantism have occasion for rejoicing and, at the same time, observing that the next step in Protestantism is a federal union. The management of the Federal Council has been admirable from the start. Every year has brought increasning confidence. Its New York office has rendered a service that has made federation the open door for Protestant unity. It has moved just fast enough and all its gains have been so firmly held that we hope the day is not far distant when every Protestant denomination will be enrolled in its membership.

The great lack in the churches to-day is heroism. As institutions they are selfish. This is true both of Catholics and Protestants. There is not an instance of any one party in the church or denomination sacrificing itself for the good of all the other churches. And yet the Founder of Christianity sacri-

ficed Himself for the good of all. Until denominationalism is willing to do some sacrificing for the good of all we will not make much progress in Christian unity.

We do a lot of sacrificing for our churches. It may have merit and it may not, but sacrificing for other denominations than our own has decided merit. Which party in the church is willing to sacrifice itself for the good of all? There are individuals who would favor this principle, but, as an organized institution, no one of the denominations would give this a serious thought.

All of the churches are still self-assertive in their official capacities. What shall we do to become Christian?

The exchanging of professors and preachers for a ship load of good will among nations is altogether worthy. A ship load of British Congregationalists visiting the Congregationalists in the United States was a fine idea. But the plan of the British Free churches to send a ship load of their representatives to visit the United Church of Canada is the kind of contribution that counts for the unity of the church. Why could not the Protestants of America make up a full passenger list of fraternal spirits for a visitation to the Protestant churches of Great Britain? And this not to be done once or twice, but to be an annual affair. The British could make return visits and, in course of time, there would be a real fellowship of British and American Protestants. The same thing might be done with other nations until there should be awakened a conscience for Protestant unity. Then we could go with the same message to Anglicans, Eastern Orthodox, and finally to Catholics. Every possible approach must be used for the unity of the church and one of the largest factors is personal contact.

Gratifying progress in Christian unity in South India is presented on another page by Dr. Banninga. Anglicans, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Wesleyans are looking forward to the consummation of their plans by 1932. They appear

to have moved forward cautiously and wisely, only we wish that they could have reduced the thirty year limit to one year, so that those of this generation might solve the issue without handing over to their children to do what they hesitated to do. The various church polities have arisen according to circumstances, sometimes abused and other times inadequate and therefore subject to such changes as local circumstances require. The connection of any of the church polities with the apostolic period is purely fragmentary. Some polity suits some countries and some peoples better than others. The episcopal polity has merit and in some stances it has worked well. Evidently it is best suited to South India; but above all polities is Spirit, which must forever hold the primary place. South India's adventure will always hold our interest.

The Prayer Book controversy in England might have given Anglicans an opportunity for a study of the whole reunion problem, but it appears to have been unobserved in the entire controversy. The method pursued was that which was adopted a century or more ago. As long as the Church of England is the established church it has two methods to pursue—the methods of a century ago and meeting defeat, or changing her attitude to the twentieth century and becoming a factor in helping toward a united Christendom. Dr. Orchard is quoted in *The Christian World*, London, as follows:

Dr. Orchard feels that, after the rejection by Parliament of the Revised Prayer Book, the establishment, as we have known it, must now come to an end. He says that to Free churchmen the spectacle of a church being compelled to ask Parliament for liberty to worship God according to its own desires is more than a humiliation or a surrender of the church's rights: it is a repudiation of Christ's Headship of the church: it is an apostasy from the apostolic order. "We ought to obey God rather than men." Dr. Orchard stands for a threefold policy: (1) disestablish the Church of England; (2) catholicize the Free churches; (3) reform Romanism. "This," he says, "is the only way to the reunion of Christendom, the revival of religion, and the reformation of society."

But Dr. Orchard is not an Anglican. It is no little thing for ecclesiastics "to forget the quarrels of their grandfathers

and to give the values of Jesus Christ the primary place they should hold," as was the recent appeal of Rev. H. R. L. Sheppard through *The Times*, when he summons to this generation "to forget the quarrels of its grandfathers and to give the values of Jesus Christ the primary place they should hold, together with the statement of what he believes His church should forego intellectually and sacrifice materially to that end." But these are the times for men to speak out and Christ will find His prophet.

We will never get anywhere in Christian unity unless we are absolutely frank in dealing with each other. It must be said to the credit of Catholics that they are more frank on this subject than most Protestants. Their frankness is frequently rude and puts unity in the remote future. However, many of the Protestant churches are equally cocksure, but they are hesitant in their approaches. Protestants must find the way to get together. There is no good reason why they should be separated as they are. If Protestantism should take the name "Christian" instead of Protestant, they would set up a new standard among themselves as well as establish a new standard of approach to others. Protestantism can never make much of an approach to Catholicism until Protestant unity is accomplished.

Protestantism need not vie with the Catholics in the use of the term "catholic." It is a great term and it has a great history. But Protestantism needs to take the term "Christian" with all of its implications and demands. Who wants to spend his time pressing the claims of Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Disciples, Methodists, Baptists, Lutherans, and the two hundred other varieties, when here are the two great terms in history—"catholic" on one hand, with all of its implications, and they are worthy, and "Christian" on the other hand, with all of its implications, and they are worthy. This is an issue of some worth. The Archbishop of Upsala suggested in his book on *Christian Fellowship* the use of the term "evangelic." But "Christian" is the better word. Luther advised it in his day

and it would have been far better if Protestants had taken the advice of their great leader. There is a tremendous amount of friendliness among Protestants. The most pressing issue in its history is its changing from the multiplicity of divisions into a united household. In observing its annual gatherings this year one is impressed with the evidence that Protestants, in the main, are facing seriously their task for a united Christendom.

The Paris Pact

WAR is outlawed. The signing of the multilateral treaty has opened the way for a new understanding of peace in the world. In the conception of the idea and in the prophetic support by many of our bravest men, a new day has dawned in the life of the nations. Thought is a greater factor in changing the face of the earth than all the armies of all the nations in the world. If there is hesitation to confirm the treaty in the United States Senate, as has been intimated, the senators will be traitors to the highest good and the blood of the battle-fields will cry out against them. If the Paris pact means anything it must mean that armaments have gone to their limit and henceforth we must talk in terms of reduction. The churches of the nations must so ring with the endorsement of the outlawry of war that there shall be a conscience around the world to think in terms of the new standard for the adjustment of international disputes. The reality of all this is dependent upon the conscience of the world.

The Universal Religious Peace Conference

IN the last few years many things have been done for the furtherance of peace, but there must be a universal spiritual disarmament before there can be a permanent building of peace in the thoughts and attitudes of the world. Many books have been written against war and in favor of peace, many churches have passed strong resolutions in their national assemblies,

conferences have been held around the world, but one of the most important movements of modern times is combining the spiritual resources of mankind as expressed by all the religions of the world in a universal religious peace conference, which is to be held in 1930, perhaps in India. Its purpose is "to direct the religious impulses of humanity against war in a constructive world-wide effort to achieve peace."

This idea was proposed by Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, secretary of the Church Peace Union, and it has met with the endorsement of editors, educators, statesmen, publicists, ministers, business men, and others. Dr. Atkinson has approached leaders among Confucianists, Hindus, Buddhists, Mohammedans, Shintoists, Jains, and others, and there have come such satisfactory responses that a preliminary conference was held last summer at Geneva, when a nucleus committee of sixteen was appointed with power to add to that number until they have a committee of seventy. This committee is to select a thousand representatives from the eleven great living religions of the world, who will compose the conference of 1930.

It will not be their purpose to form a league on comparative religions, but the purpose is to discover the highest teachings of the various religions on peace and the present day attitude of their leaders; likewise the efforts that they have put forth for the furtherance of those ideals and to devise means both for the expression of good-will and for coöperation in a great world effort to abolish war and make peace a permanent factor in the world.

Perhaps the religions have not been very active in peace efforts except indirectly and sentimentally. This is a challenge for the religions of the world to come up to that higher plane of life which deals with obligations to live peaceably together and make that peace the standard for the world. It is an opportunity for taking stock and discovering where we are as well as setting up new standards of coöperation, both among ourselves and with other religions. It is a great movement. The Universal Religious Peace Conference of 1930 is an idealism with the finest possibilities before it. It should call for the enthusiastic

support of the Christians of the whole world, irrespective of their denominational affiliations. It is an adventure to write peace in the spiritual experiences of mankind.

Kansas City Conference

A conference on Christian unity similar to the Baltimore Conference of the Christian Unity League will be held in Kansas City on January 16 and 17, 1929. It will be a part of the work of the Christian Unity League and its program will be of the same character, with addresses in the morning, group conferences in the afternoon, and general conference at 4:30, and with two addresses on the first evening and one address on the second evening, closing with the celebration of the Lord's supper, presided over by Rev. Dr. Burris A. Jenkins, assisted by ministers of other communions.

With three outstanding instances of intercommunion associated with Christian unity conferences, it is not as awkward as it was a year or more ago. It was done at the Baltimore conference with the bread and wine distributed through the audience by Baptists, Congregationalists, Disciples, Episcopalians, Evangelicals, Lutherans, Methodists, Presbyterians, Reformed, and Universalists. The Ohio Pastors' Convention, consisting of a thousand ministers from more than a dozen denominations, celebrated the Lord's supper at the close of its session. The San Francisco Conference, under the leadership of Bishop Edward L. Parsons, celebrated the Lord's supper at the beginning of their conference. So that we may expect in the Kansas City Conference the celebration of the Lord's supper to be an integral part of the conference without any thought of what its awkwardness was years before. If we cannot behave better around the Lord's supper than making protests against intercommunion, we had better do as a writer in this issue of *The Christian Union Quarterly* remarks — all of us become Quakers and not have any material elements in the supper. But we have got to be patient with each other and allow time for growth from error into truth.

The Kansas City Conference promises to be in every respect as fine a program and as largely attended as the Baltimore Conference. There will be that same freedom of discussion and every person who attends will have an opportunity of expressing his views and of giving his spirit to a better understanding among the churches. All denominations will be welcomed to membership in the conference. Out of the two days of addresses and conference ought to come such recommendations to the churches as will set us forward both in our thought and in our practice. The next issue of *The Christian Union Quarterly* will publish the program in full.

Such a conference should be multiplied all over the country. There will be a New England Conference held in Boston on November 20-22 for the purpose of making known what happened at Lausanne in August, 1927, and to emphasize the importance of continuing that work. Among those who will speak are Bishop Slattery, Rev. Frederick A. Wilmot, Rev. Raymond Calkins, President Daniel L. Marsh, and Rt. Rev. Logan H. Roots. This of itself is a fine program. There will be group conferences on the second day. There ought to be other such conferences throughout the fall and winter. While there is much general interest in Christian unity, if it is to be capitalized into general movements, there must be conferences where people, both ministers and laymen, can discuss the whole field of approach. With such programs there will be substantial progress.

The Protests of Denominationalism to Brotherhood

SOME time ago the Disciples and Congregationalists of New York State arranged to have their state conventions together, conducting their denominational business separately, but having most of the addresses of the conventions in a common meeting place. It was a fine idea and nothing but good could come out of it. Rev. Archie B. Bedford, Syracuse, N. Y., writing in *World Call*, St. Louis, the missionary organ of the Disciples, says:

For many years the New York Congregational Conference and the New York and New Jersey Christian Missionary Society have met at the same

time, but in different cities. Two years ago we invited the Congregationalists to unite with us in a joint convention. They accepted the invitation and the date was set and Syracuse was to be the convention city. This convention has just come to a close. It is too early to write its history, for its influence will be lasting in our own state and we hope it will inspire many similar conventions throughout the world.

The purpose of the convention was not to unite the two churches, for we realize that we are not ready for unity — as much as it is needed. The aim was simply that we might have the joys of the rich fellowship that such a convention would give and that we might begin in a real way to develop that Christian unity which must precede church unity. We were richly rewarded in the fulfilment of our purpose. The convention moved smoothly, without one moment of friction. The reason was the fine Christian spirit and courtesy of E. C. Warner, the Congregational layman moderator, and Finis S. Idleman, the Disciple moderator, who presided together over the many sessions.

While continuation committees were appointed, the purpose of the convention was not to unite the two churches, but that we might enjoy the rich fellowship and Christian experience of meeting together. We were abundantly rewarded, for the convention fulfilled our expectations in every way. We will always have a warmer heart for our Congregational brethren and a keen appreciation of their fine Christian spirit, and we feel they will always love us more and appreciate the work we are trying to do for Christ. It is our hope that this method of developing Christian unity will be followed by the Disciples in every state, not only with the Congregationalists, who are closely akin to us, but with any and all Christian churches who are ready to try the experiment which we have found so fruitful. We have preached organic church unity, which cannot come until we have learned to practice Christian unity, and Christian unity will come when we come to know, to appreciate, and to love our fellow Christians in deeds as well as in words.

But the denominational element among the Disciples took exceptions to such meetings of Disciples and Congregationalists. This was voiced both by *The Christian-Evangelist*, St. Louis, and *The Christian Standard*, Cincinnati. These papers are of the same type, differing mainly in that the former supports only the regular or organized missionary work of the Disciples and the latter supports almost every other kind of missionary work among the Disciples except the regular organized missionary work. The former is more denominational than the latter, always heartily supporting every move for organized denominational life among the Disciples. The latter is strongly

independent and speaks without fear or favor in its interpretations of that phase of the Disciple message that prevailed among the pioneers of that movement. Both are ably edited and have about equal constituencies.

They represent that type of denominationalism that prevails in the conservative press of all denominations and both are ready to speak out if any of their denominational traditions are touched. For no consideration of Christian brotherhood must any of the things that separate us be modified to the slightest degree, but Christian unity must come by all the other denominations accepting what the one denomination stands for. Our Catholic brethren felt the same way about the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order. Rome had nothing to confer about. All others must surrender to her. Since others were not willing to do that Rome declined the invitation. *The Christian-Evangelist* and *The Christian Standard* appear to have regarded the New York State Disciples' invitation to the Congregationalists for joint conventions as improper unless the Congregationalists came in preparation for their baptism by immersion.

The Christian-Evangelist goes still further and refers to the Disciple speakers on the program of the joint convention as "some of the speakers wearing the name Disciples," implying that such speakers had no right to be called Disciples. At the same time that journal implies that the Disciple speakers were dishonest enough to make the impression that "the great bulk of the Disciples" were ready to "give up or compromise immersion" and that the Congregationalists were ignorant enough to believe it. It is interesting to note who some of these Disciple speakers were — Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, the editor of *The Christian Century*; Dr. Finis S. Idleman, minister of Central Church, New York City; Dr. A. W. Fortune, minister of Central Church, Lexington, Ky.; and others. One could not select a dozen of the most outstanding Disciples in America without including their names — men who have borne witness amid many difficulties to the finest and truest things for which the Disciples stand. But the Disciple denominational press

would have put all these men out of the Disciples if they could have done so. Here is the note from *The Christian-Evangelist*:

Some of the speakers wearing the name Disciples, it is reported, told the Congregationalists that we have the open pulpit, open communion, and that to perfectly clear the way we must have open membership. Of course the things are not on a parity. When a man comes to preach in your pulpit he is a guest, when he comes to the Lord's supper, he is also a guest along with you at the Master's table. He performs these spiritual functions and exercises as directed by Jesus Christ. When he comes to baptism the case is different. He is asking you to take him in as more than a guest. He is to become a member and to function as a director of the work and he ought, therefore, to comply with the New Testament conditions of church membership. And no living man has the right to change these.

The brethren who hold out to anybody that the Disciples are becoming an "open membership church" are speaking only their own wishes and views. Not 1/50 of one per cent of the Disciples would agree to it. It is quite unfair, therefore, to the great bulk of Disciples as well as misleading to the Congregationalists to hold out to them that we are about to give up or compromise immersion. But the worst of it is, that it is the kind of thing that creates division instead of effecting union.

The love of party is the tragedy of Christianity. Denominationalism is the same whether it is Protestant or Catholic. The Disciples regard themselves divinely appointed guardians of certain things as Catholics regard themselves divinely appointed guardians of certain other things. Both loyally stand by their guardianships. Here is an illustration of the Catholics. Father Colgan, writing in *The Southern Cross*, Johannesburg, Cape Town, South Africa, says:

The Catholic Church has a monopoly of revealed truth. She has the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Her creed is divine; her constitution is divine. There can be no question of compromise, of concession; there can be no question then of "corporate reunion." Only one road leads to Rome, the road of submission to a divinely established authority. The church, even if she had the will, has not the power to alter one jot or tittle of the truth committed to her keeping. If only one insignificant article of Catholic faith forced the barrier between Rome and all the Protestant churches in England or the whole world, "reunion" would be as remote as it is to-day.

A certain amount of bewilderment and misunderstanding has been caused by the fairly recent "Malines conversations." Lord Halifax, who

with a few Anglican divines represented the Church of England (or thought they were representing it) in the private room at Malines, has the cause of union between Rome and Canterbury very much at heart. I am afraid that a perusal of the summaries I have seen of the report issued by the Anglican members of the conference make it difficult to avoid the conclusion that the viscount is a dangerous busybody. He ought to know the true position and the relative strength of the various parties in the Church of England; yet he clearly made the impression on the Belgian and French theologians that the "Anglo-Catholic" party could speak for the whole Church of England. What other explanation is there of the French memorandum that "an agreement is reached without much difficulty" on various doctrinal points, of which one is: "by consecration the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ"? If the many discussions on the proposed new Prayer Book make one thing plain it is that belief in the real presence is no part of the creed of the Church of England.

It is difficult, too, to avoid the conclusion that Cardinal Mercier, with all respect to the memory of a great Catholic and an eminent philosopher, made a tactical blunder in entering into such discussions.

Our Baptist brethren are equally loyal to their traditions, and therefore some of their publications become somewhat disturbed now and then over some move toward Christian unity, and diligently warn their readers to be on their guard. *The Western Recorder*, Louisville, Ky., a paper widely read among Southern Baptists, says:

We need not here suggest how empty and vain are nearly all of the underlying motives which are working for church union. They depend upon material power and influence to bring their ends to fruition instead of upon the Spirit of Christ. Nor need we here set forth the convincing arguments to the effect that real union of heart—which is the union sought by our Lord—already exists in the Christian denominations, and that this loud and swaggering effort for formal union is the negation of that spiritual unity which already exists in the churches of Christ to a far larger degree than may be found between any other bodies whatever in the world.

There has been much unwarranted and unjust propaganda against the denominations at this point. It has had its origin either in a spirit of worldly-wise self-assurance or else in ignorance of the real facts of the case. Baptists should study these facts. They will find very little help in the secular press, and equally little in the average "inter"-denominational gathering. Their children are often having the contrary thing taught to them in those educational institutions that dabble with religion from the outside but reject the redemptive Christ.

What is being sought in this unionism cult is a human and worldly substitute for the unity which we have in the blessed Christ through faith in Him. God give us wisdom as we seek to protect our people from having this vast ecclesiastical "gold brick" sold them. Men among us who are spiritually undeveloped will often need patient instruction, for this ecclesiastical "gold brick" is broadly reputed as of twenty-four carat purity among a large proportion of the business associates of the average city man.

On leaving the atmosphere of the denominational press, it is refreshing to find the daily papers speaking out for Christian unity and doing it with a passion that makes a strange contrast by the side of denominational objections to Christian unity. It reveals how far the divided church is trailing behind. Fortunately and necessarily the denominational press is losing its hold on the denominations. One time it was a powerful voice. It is not so to-day. An editor of one of the leading denominational papers of the country, and a high class paper at that, said to us some time ago that in his judgment not many who subscribed to the denominational papers read them. The people are ahead of their journals. They are thinking in terms of a larger brotherhood, which they find frequently better expressed in daily papers. On the occasion of the joint convention of the Disciples and Congregationalists in Syracuse, *The Herald* of that city had a lengthy editorial at the close of the convention on "Christian Unity," closing with the following paragraph:

That the Syracuse joint convention is regarded as of tremendous importance in the Protestant church world is evidenced by the space devoted to it in both the news and editorial columns of the press of many cities. Most of those who comment agree that a real beginning is being made toward the unification of the Protestant communions. Syracuse bids fair to go down in church history as the place where an epochal and long-awaited movement began its consummation.

Christian unity is in the thought of the church around the world. There are likewise strong protests against it in denominational centers around the world. But the multitudes who are thinking are too great and too earnestly following the Spirit of Christ to be checked in what must some day be a brotherhood of all who accept Jesus as Lord and Redeemer.

THE GROWING UNITY OF THE CHURCH

BY REV. FREDERICK LYNCH, D. D.

Educational Secretary of the Church Peace Union, New York, and
Associate Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*

I USE the word unity not as referring to organic union but unity in thought and service. I have just attended three remarkable conferences in Prague. The first was that of the international committee of the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches (August 26-31); the second that of the continuation committee of "Life and Work" (September 2-5); the third that of the continuation committee of "Faith and Order" (September 6-9). I am just on my way to Geneva to attend a fourth conference, which, while not one of the Christian churches, has been called by the Church Peace Union and aims at the unity of all religions in the service of universal peace. I refer to the Universal Religious Peace Conference to be held September 11-14 at Geneva. I shall hope to say something about that in a later issue of this magazine, but meantime it is interesting to note that the Church Peace Union has persuaded some of the most outstanding leaders of Hinduism, Mohammedanism, Brahmanism, Shintoism, and Confucianism to participate in this preliminary meeting to consider a world congress of all religions in 1931 or 1932 at which it is hoped to bring together at least 500 religious leaders of every creed, race, and nationality to consider what contribution each religion may of itself make to the growing sense of brotherhood and what all the religions together may do to spread the spirit of peace. (They nearly all profess to make peace one of their chief aims.)

The thing that greatly impressed me in all three of the conferences at Prague was the remarkable sense of unity

already achieved and which is a new thing in the world. It was not evident at the first meetings of the World Alliance at The Hague in 1919, neither was it very manifest at the first meetings of the Life and Work committee at Helsingfors in 1923. Even at Stockholm in 1925 there was a feeling of "separateness" — it largely passed away before that great congress was over — which one did not feel in the least at Prague. This was especially noticeable in two instances, that of the relations of the Lutherans of Germany with the British and American delegates and that of the delegates of the Eastern churches with their Western brethren. I have been at practically every annual meeting of the World Alliance since The Hague meeting in 1919 and at most of the meetings of the continuation committee of Life and Work, as well as the several preparatory meetings held before Stockholm, and I can remember what very decided suspicions, both theological and political, the German churches had of their British and American brethren—fear both of too much emphasis upon the social idea of the gospel, too much tendency to think of the aim of the gospel, the establishment of a kingdom of God in the earth, too much disposition to think of religion in terms of activity instead of in terms of faith, thought, explanation of the universe and of the inner life. On the other hand the British and American brethren felt themselves separated from the German brethren by a broad and deep chasm on the question of the attitude of the church and Christianity itself toward war. The American brethren just simply could not understand a church or a people that insisted that war or peace was none of the church's business and who said that the state was not bound by the same Christian ethics as the individual. Suspicions of a different sort were a barrier between the free, unhampered, warm, absolutely confiding relations between the Eastern Orthodox group and the Western brethren. Now this has all largely passed away, due to the annual gatherings of the World Alliance, Life and Work, and Faith and Order. I am not alone in this observation of the wonderful growth in unity during these years. Such men as Doctors Atkinson, Macfarland, Merrill, and Plimpton, who

have attended these meetings with me during these last ten years, commented upon the same thing at Prague. Mr. George A. Plimpton, who responded to the address of welcome from the city of Prague, called especial attention to the growth from the first beginnings of the World Alliance at Constance in 1914, when a handful of *strangers* met at the invitation of the Church Peace Union, which had just been endowed by Mr. Carnegie, to the present meeting, when two hundred men from all over the world were meeting as friends. A real unity has come and it augurs well for the future. Perhaps this "understanding," this new sense of oneness, this consciousness of unity in the doctrines that touch the common life and work of the church may be the first and necessary step toward organic union.

The World Alliance brought about two hundred delegates to Prague. The city had made great preparations for their coming and turned over the Parliament buildings for their meetings. Prague is of course largely Roman Catholic but the evangelical churches are strong and gave the delegates a hospitable welcome. Between the Roman Catholics and the Evangelicals is the New National Church, generally called the New Catholic Church. It is a little too soon to prophesy as to the future of this church. I rather got the impression that many have been somewhat disappointed in it. Perhaps the moving impulse was not a desire to reform Roman Catholic practices and doctrine, not even to escape the rule of the pope, so much as a political impulse. There was a remarkable outburst of nationalism in Czecho-Slovakia and hence a sudden movement for a national church with the national language (the services, mass and all, are in the vernacular). Anyhow it did not join heartily with the Protestant brethren in welcoming the World Alliance. The chief subject announced for the conference at Prague was "The Church and Disarmament." This subject was treated in several papers, one of the most outstanding being that of the chief justice of the German Supreme Court, Dr. Simons. It attracted wide attention throughout Europe because of its conciliatory and Christian spirit. So long as Germany listens to such of her new leaders as Stresemann and Simons

she will be a great influence for peace in Europe. Of course the whole conference was colored by the Briand-Kellogg Treaties. They were being signed in Paris on the Monday morning the World Alliance was in session at Prague, and the World Alliance sent a telegram to the foreign ministers gathered together in Paris. The delegates at Prague were quick to seize upon the significance of these treaties for disarmament. For the last two or three years they had been expressing their feelings to the effect that the churches were getting tired of the governments signing arbitration treaties and Locarno pacts which logically carried limitation of armaments with them, and then doing nothing looking toward disarmament. Was this going to be another case? was the question raised by Professor Hull and others. If so, it was of no value except as registering a vague, if pious, sentiment and would have no effect in preventing wars. The general feeling at Prague was that *armed nations would fight, just as armed men do, regardless of all the treaties or pacts or leagues or courts in the world*. Perhaps the most vociferous applause of the conference came when Dr. Fred B. Smith, addressing a great mass meeting said: "The next twelve months will reveal the value of the Kellogg pacts. Unless the nations signing them move at once for a reduction of armaments, hypocrisy will be evident somewhere." I ought to add that much disappointment has been expressed, I might almost say consternation felt, not only by the delegates at Prague, but throughout Europe, that just when Mr. Kellogg was starting for Europe with a peace pact which renounced force forever, Mr. Hoover should have made the unfortunate remark to the effect that the defense of the United States must be kept up so that she would be "respected" by the other nations. Of course "respected" was interpreted by everybody in Europe as "feared" — and rightly so interpreted, I think. I doubt if anyone who was not here in the midst of two hundred Englishmen, Germans, and Frenchmen can realize the effect of that remark coming to Europe right along with the Kellogg treaties. The Europeans simply could not see how the two things go together. I heard them saying: "Is the United States

afraid to trust the other nations who are signing? Does she think we are hypocrites? Does the United States want to be respected for her armed strength or for her righteousness and justice?"

The continuation committee of Life and Work followed immediately after the World Alliance. There was a remarkably full attendance, nearly all the sixty members being present, with practically all the communions and nations being represented. The committee held its three days sessions in a restaurant on an island in the beautiful Vitava, which flows through the middle of Prague as the Seine through Paris or the Thames through London. The first thing that impressed one was the remarkable progress that had been made in the three years since Stockholm. It was evident from the reports from each country that Life and Work had taken a real hold of the churches. This is largely due to the excellent and now well established International Social Institute at Geneva, which has been rendering excellent service to the churches in furnishing them with information about the activities of all the churches in social service and in promoting the united activities of the Continental churches. This institute, set up and supported by "Life and Work," has been under the able direction of Dr. Adolf Keller, assisted by experts loaned to the institute by the churches of various countries. Especial mention should be made of the help rendered by Dr. Worth M. Tippy, who was loaned to the institute for six months by our own Federal Council of Churches. It is hoped that the churches will extend this practice of loaning experts to assist Dr. Keller at Geneva. Germany has already made a beginning. Naturally most of the discussion at Prague centered about the work of the institute — how to finance it and how to extend its usefulness. It has already become an extremely helpful center for all Protestant activities in Europe. It has won the confidence of the churches and will eventually become a great Protestant center. There was also much discussion over the quarterly magazine published by the continuation committee — "Stockholm." It is in itself an example of unity, as it is printed in three languages — English,

French, and German. The chief difficulty about it is that while the Germans and French can generally read the three languages, the British and Americans can generally read only one. For the present it will be continued in this form, but changes may eventually have to be made. Another question discussed was that of unifying the various church agencies dealing with world, social, industrial, and international problems so they will come under the general direction of "Life and Work." The question of answering the last papal encyclical was quite warmly discussed. It was finally agreed to appoint a representative committee to prepare a statement, to be acted upon a year hence — setting forth the real unity that already existed among the Protestant churches in the field of the common service of Jesus Christ. This would be the best answer to the encyclical.

The continuation committee on "Faith and Order" commenced immediately after the "Life and Work." The work of this committee was necessarily confined more to routine business than to general discussion, but there were some interesting moments. The question of answering the pope's encyclical came up here as it had in "Life and Work" and certain of the brethren insisted that a reply be issued. Finally it was agreed that, since "Life and Work" had delegated to its committee of theological professors, with Dr. Deissmann as chairman, the task of preparing a worthy and dignified statement on the unity of Protestantism in life, love, and work, the matter be left there. The reports from the different denominational commissions on Christian unity about the progress of the Lausanne idea in their own communions and countries was very encouraging as well as the reports on the denominational adoption of the reports issued at Lausanne. The action of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States was one of the encouraging incidents. The spread of the Lausanne idea had been more general in some countries than others, but every report brought to this Prague meeting showed how much more wide-spread the whole interest in organic union had become since Lausanne. The hope was expressed that the mem-

bers of the continuation committee would do everything in their power to spread the knowledge of what was accomplished at Lausanne and secure wide study and consideration of the reports. On the other hand the warmest discussion of the session came upon the presentation of a communication from a group of Protestant Episcopal leaders of America who have been closely identified with the Faith and Order movement, to the effect that national groups or communions or commissions associated with "Faith and Order" ought not to attempt to arrange such meetings as would embarrass certain communions were they asked to take part. Although common communion services were not mentioned, the members of the committee took the communication as referring to such services. The communication emphasized the necessity of the national groups of "Faith and Order" confining themselves to the one purpose of Lausanne — "The exploring of our differences and agreements." It is not unfair to say that the communication did not produce a good impression on the majority of the delegates. It was warmly debated and, while all agreed that certain practices should not be indulged in under the ægis of the World Conference on Faith and Order, many delegates felt that there was little hope of progress toward unity if real experiments in unity were not made. One service where all communions sat down together, would have more effect in convincing the world of the possibility of union than many conferences.

As I close this article the meeting of the committee to decide whether a Universal Religious Peace Conference shall be held two or three years hence, is just assembling at Geneva. Two hundred delegates have arrived representing every great religion of the world. I must send this letter off now so cannot write about it. I will have some report to make later. This committee has been called by the Church Peace Union in the faith that all the great religions have peace as one of their fundamental ideals, therefore they might come together to tell one another what they were doing, as religions, to promote the peace movement and universal brotherhood on which it rests, and what possibility there was of united action of all religions to outlaw war and establish lasting peace.

FREDERICK LYNCH.

THE PROPOSED UNION OF THE CHRISTIAN AND CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES

AS SEEN BY REV. F. G. COFFIN, D. D.

President of the General Convention of the Christian Church, Albany, Mo.

THE General Convention of the Christian Church has declared its attitude as follows:

1. That the spirit of denominationalism as it has dominated the past, has delayed the establishment of Christ's kingdom on earth.

2. That no great aggressive movement of the church can take place in the future until its forces are more closely united.

3. That the rank and file of the churches are in heart ready for a closer unity, if the emphasis of thought can be taken from the few divisive features and centered on the great unities of faith and work.

4. That the Christian Church has no greater mission to this age than to make itself a unifying factor among the churches.

As early as 1919 the Quadrennial session meeting in Conneaut, Ohio, directed its commission on Christian unity to make operative the following pronouncement:

That the Christian Church makes loving overtures to all true Christians everywhere, of whatever name or order, to unite by legal incorporation, placing all interests now owned and controlled by said convention under the ownership and control of the amalgamated organization. The basis of union shall derive its government, always to be democratic, from the people composing it. All of its official gatherings shall be representative of the people and such representation shall be voted by them. No test of faith shall be required other than the acceptance of Jesus Christ as the Savior and the word of God as a standard for the conduct of life and the guide of the church. The standing of all members shall be equal. They shall each be free to follow the Lord as His Spirit and word direct them. Their standing in the church shall be based upon their Christian conduct—not upon the theological opinions of themselves or others. It shall be a union founded in fellowship solely upon righteousness in character and practice. We believe that the designation of this organic union of denominations should, out of loyalty to Christ, bear the name of Christian, but are seriously willing to consider with other bodies appropriate additions to this designation which will preserve their historic identity.

That definite and, so far as may be consistent with Christian courtesy, continued approach be made to those bodies most closely allied in organization, belief, observation of ordinances, and general practices to the Christian Church, with a view to securing coöperation, and, if possible, organic union.

Carrying out this action the Commission on Christian Unity of the convention addressed an overture to a number of communions setting forth certain principles of Christian unity and outlining the convictions of the majority of the Christian Church relative to them. This communication invited conference with any other body or bodies "to discover and discuss our common tenets, practices, and what adjustments may be possible in the interest of a closer relationship."

The Congregational Church responded hospitably to these overtures and conferences began. Of these there have been several, all of them making progress toward corporate unity. The last of these conferences went so far as to work out possible plans of amalgamation and administration. It is heartening to discover that there seems to be no serious difficulties in the way of realizing the consummation of this plan. As far as the effort has progressed there is near unanimity in both communions. There has been but one dominating motive in the whole effort, viz: a greater efficiency for the kingdom of God. Each group has tried to recognize and embody the viewpoint of the other as fully as possible and certainly in no way to affect the historic position of the other or to restrict its freedom.

There are many points in common between the two bodies, while their differences are slight.

The congregational form of government prevails in both communions though each recognizes that this alone is not a sufficient basis for union.

In each the individual church is the unit from which authority is derived for the general body. In both general official bodies their government is representative and democratic.

Each church accepts the Bible as the supreme rule of both faith and practice and recognizes the right of free interpretation of the Scriptures. No creed can be binding upon either individuals or congregations.

Both fellowships grant full individual liberty in practicing the ordinances of the church, accepting Christianity as an accomplishment of character and a way of life.

The distribution of their strength geographically, the similarity of communicants, the location of educational and missionary enterprises make a combination of their forces wise.

Increasingly there has been an exchange of pastors and joint educational work between the two communions.

Both bodies are of the conviction that a closer affiliation of church forces is essential to building the kingdom of God. Their past history is free from conflicts or misunderstandings with each other.

The methods of administration employed by each are strikingly similar, only slight modifications being necessary to perfectly coördinate their organizations.

In view of these and many other considerations the continued detachment of the two bodies seems unwarranted. Reactions toward the proposed union have been invited through the periodicals of the Christian Church. These have been of enthusiastic approval. Private correspondents and conference bodies from many sources have registered a similar attitude.

It is now hoped that official action may be concluded in both bodies during 1929, following which the process of transforming the two churches into one will be effected as rapidly as possible.

The Commission on Christian Unity is at present engaged in a widespread program of education of the church's constituency toward this and all other unifying gestures.

AS SEEN BY REV. CHARLES EMERSON BURTON, D. D.

Secretary of the National Council of Congregational Churches in the
United States, New York

THE respective commissions of the two denominations are uniting in recommending to the next national gatherings the complete merger of the National Convention of the Christian

Churches and the National Council of the Congregational Churches. Both bodies being wholly democratic, the merger of state and local organizations, and particularly the merger of individual churches, would be wholly dependent upon the action of those bodies themselves.

Why should these denominations unite? This is not a fair question. It should be put the other way, why should they not unite, for certainly the burden of proof should be demanded of followers of Christ holding the same faith and governed by the same polity, if professing to follow the same leader they refuse to walk together after Him. These two groups of churches hold almost identical principles of polity and conceptions of faith; moreover, both of them believe deeply in the importance of church union. It would seem as though the only reason why they have not been together in the past has been lack of acquaintance, and that having got acquainted there is no good reason why they should not perfect their oneness of spirit by a unity of organizations.

The decisive motive, however, ought to be the recognition of the mind of the Master expressed in the great pastoral prayer for the oneness of His followers. If, however, it seems as though this is but a small step toward the unity of the people of Christ, it is, nevertheless, difficult to see why this comparatively easy step should not be taken promptly, particularly so since it will be a practical testimony to the possibilities of unity. We have talked it for generations; to practice it will speak much louder than all our preaching.

Turning to some of the secondary reasons for the unity of these two bodies, it is obvious that here, as everywhere, there is strength in unity. 100,000 followers of Christ in a population of more than 100,000,000 people is not a sufficiently large company to give the full value of the sense of fellowship. While 1,000,000 members (the union would mean more than 1,000,000) does not mean one of the greatest fellowships, it is large enough to give a sense of nation-wide contact and effectiveness of operation.

The two groups are to a considerable extent geographically complimentary. In sections of the country where there are few or no Congregational churches there are substantial numbers of Christian churches. This is particularly true in the south-east. Generally speaking also the Christian churches are more largely rural; while though the Congregational churches are not urban distinctively they are stronger in city centers. In the past where members of Christian churches have moved to cities they have found no churches of their own fellowship, and to no small degree city Congregational churches have lost the strength which has come to many denominations through the removal of rural members to city residences.

The supply of ministers and the proper distribution of ministers is another important point. Some groups will be materially strengthened by the close relations of a larger group of ordained workers available for the different types of churches. There is no reason why the minister of a Congregational church should not be educated in the same institution with a minister for the Christian church, and *vice versa*. The proposed union will make this not only possible but natural. In the same connection the support of the ministry and ministerial pensions are involved. It happens that by the development in recent years of the annuity fund for Congregational ministers, the Congregational churches are in the forefront in providing a just and fairly adequate system of retiring pensions. It will strengthen this system for the ministers of the Christian churches to be a part of it and it will bring to those ministers privileges which are not now theirs.

In the field of Christian education the colleges and educational institutions of the Christian church will supplement for Congregationalists the work they are doing in different parts of the country. As in the case of the churches, so also here, these educational institutions are located in parts of the country where Congregational institutions are few or absent. On the other side the merger will make more available to the people of the Christian churches the splendid educational insti-

tutions developed by the Congregational churches. In a real sense they will become their own.

In the help now derived from the great programs of the denominations, such, for example, as the religious educational program, the preparation of literature for church schools and all departments of church life, evangelistic programs in connection with applied Christianity in all directions, there will be high advantages and economies for all concerned.

Both communions are missionary in spirit. In the home missionary field union would make possible the elimination of overlapping, not to say competition. More important than this, however, will be the mutual strength that will come to the two sets of agencies by the uniting forces. Similar things will apply to the foreign missionary work with modification of details.

Just to make this article balance I have tried to set down a list of obstacles in the way. I confess they seem to be trivial, but here they are:

Sentiments rule our lives more than we are wont to acknowledge, and of course sentiments are attached to our religious associations and histories. If we fear that these are going to be trampled upon we shall shrink from merger. Is there, however, any necessity for sacrificing sentiments attached to real values? Should not these real values with their sentiments be taken into the larger group where they would be magnified rather than minimized?

Our circles of acquaintance are natural developments, and I suppose it is not a fanciful fear when we wonder whether we shall feel strange with each other. In other departments of human life, however, we are constantly making new friends, and the broader view rejoices in the possibility of the enlarged circle without the loss of any of the values of the smaller circle.

The habits of individual life are matched by the ways of doing things in group life. It is to be expected that such a union as is proposed would change some of the ways of doing things for Congregationalists and Christians alike, but where we have had fine ways of doing things it ought to be expected that those fine ways would be extended to others rather than

taken from us, and if we have had ways of doing things that are not the best, perhaps we ought to face the necessity of abandoning them.

Christian people are not free from the use of shibboleths. Congregationalists have certain pet phrases that they like to reiterate. I seem to sense the same situation with our Christian brethren. We may wonder whether we shall have to stop saying things in just the way we have been saying them, if we broaden our family life. Perhaps so, and if it constitutes a real obstacle we should weigh its importance.

A little more difficult is the question of names. Even the ladies are coming in some small degree to demand the privilege of keeping their maiden names when they get married. In such cases there seems to be the necessity of recognizing the other name in some way. Now the two commissions are proposing something of the same kind for this merger, namely, that both names should be recognized. This would apply to the national organizations. What the practice should be for the local church would be left to the local church. A church in Congregational fellowship is sometimes known by some other name than Congregational, such as "the Church of Christ." We will not blink the fact, however, that there is some real difficulty in thinking of forsaking a cherished name, and particularly of thinking of assuming another name. This difficulty the two commissions believe can be overcome. It will call for some gray matter to adjust organizations. What will become of conventions, associations, conferences, clubs, ministers' organizations, and the like? That will be for these organizations themselves to determine. Naturally, however, there will be a stir and many changes. Life, it is to be remembered, ceases when a body becomes changeless. It may be that change would mean life in many quarters.

Real obstacles — not necessarily such as cannot be overcome, however, do appear in connection with vested interests. Here the laws of many states are involved, including charters of corporations and the conditions of financial trusts, all of which must be carefully guarded under penalty of forfeiture

should trusts be violated. Here again, however, the difficulties are not insuperable. In fact, it would be quite possible, if that seems the best course, to keep all such interests separate. It is to be expected, however, that whatever legal necessities might require separate maintenance there would be a real merger of the actual work of the churches. Experience in this field is wide on the part of religious organizations and the way through will not be seriously difficult.

When such union is talked of ordinarily people wonder whether it will be possible to take care of officials and dignitaries. For some reason this question has not arisen in any of the conferences. Personally I am convinced it will not appear as an obstacle in any sense.

Those who are familiar with either the Christian Church or the Congregational Church will have sensed in what has been said the conception that the individual church is wholly self-controlling and that what we are talking of in this union is the merging of fellowship activity in the broad sense of that word, and particularly the activities which center in the National Convention and in the National Council. Naturally what is done in these assemblies, however, is likely to affect district, state and local organizations; that is, the state conferences of Congregational churches and district conventions of Christian churches, while free to maintain separate existence, would very naturally gravitate together, as would also the associations of Congregational churches and similar groups of Christian churches; but when it comes to the local church the situation would be identical with the situation which maintains when there are two Congregational churches, for example, in a given town. If only one is necessary the question arises Why should they not unite? The same question will arise where a Christian and a Congregational church occupy the same territory where one church is sufficient. It will be for the churches themselves to determine absolutely what their course should be, but the merger in the fellowship organizations would have a natural tendency to reinforce the movement for union in the local field. What this merger proposes is that when the churches

assemble for fellowship and when they undertake common tasks in kingdom endeavor, that fellowship should include all of these churches to their mutual strength and effectiveness.

The secretary of the National Council of Congregational Churches has no authority to speak for his brethren. He is glad, however, to observe that wherever this proposal has had discussion it has been heartily received and enthusiastically welcomed. That there should be none who look askance upon it is not to be expected — perhaps not to be desired, but so far as the pulse of the denomination has been felt, practical unanimity exists in favor of this proposal.

EXPANSION

Is this the time, O Church of Christ! to sound
Retreat? To arm with weapons cheap and blunt
The men and women who have borne the brunt
Of truth's fierce strife, and nobly held their ground?
Is this the time to halt, when all around
Horizons lift, new destinies confront,
Stern duties wait our nation, never wont
To play the laggard, when God's will was found?

No! rather, strengthen stakes and lengthen cords,
Enlarge thy plans and gifts, O thou elect,
And to thy kingdom come for such a time!
The earth with all its fullness is the Lord's.
Great things attempt for Him, great things expect,
Whose love imperial is, whose power sublime.

—*Charles Summer Hoyt.*

PROGRESS IN CHURCH UNION IN SOUTH INDIA

BY REV. JOHN J. BANNINGA, D. D.

President of the South India United Church, Pasumalai, South India

SINCE April, 1919, church union has been a vital problem in South India. In September of that year, the South India United Church appointed an official committee to enter into negotiations with representatives of the Anglican Church looking to the formation of a united church. These negotiations were carried on until February, 1925, when the General Synod of the Wesleyan Church in South India also entered into the negotiations and has since then taken its full share in the work. The facts of this movement were before the World Conference that met at Lausanne, and in turn the inspiration gained from Lausanne has encouraged the churches in South India to continue with their negotiations.

The problem that is before these churches may be thus stated:—How can churches with Anglican, Congregational, Presbyterian, and Wesleyan antecedents form themselves into one church in South India which will receive from the past of its constituent members the best that each has inherited, maintain these gifts as integral parts of the united church while at the same time it becomes truly one church and also becomes so truly Indian in its life, thought, and expression that the people of this land will look upon it as their very own and will bring into it the best gifts that they have received throughout their past history and especially enabling them to interpret Christ anew so that He will live again in India?

This is not an easy task. It would not even be an easy task if Europeans took their hands off the negotiations and left them entirely to Indians, for most Indians have become quite thoroughly indoctrinated and are intensely loyal to their own church whether that be Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Con-

gregational in polity. There are many in each of these groups that regard their own form of worship and doctrine as true, and feel that they cannot conscientiously give them up for anything else. Hence provision has to be made for a wide inclusiveness, and this is perhaps a matter of great gain, for the resultant church will be all the richer for such inclusiveness.

Since the first meeting of the joint committee, there have been six additional meetings and in each the representatives of the churches have tried to find a way by which the churches could become one. Sometimes they thought they had found a way, but when the findings of their meetings were referred to the churches these could not see their way to accept them. Then the committee had to meet again and try to find another way. But each meeting has found the committee more in harmony, and though the membership of the joint committee has been by no means continuous, there has been a growing sense of unity there that means much for the united church, for, if fellowship in such meetings can produce an atmosphere of unity, surely the actual union of the churches and fellowship in the deepest things of life will bind the churches into one.

The difficulties in South India have been the same as those that have arisen in other countries. There was first the question of episcopacy. But this was settled when the South India United Church voted to accept a constitutional episcopacy as the basis of further negotiations. This form of episcopacy was carefully defined and it was clearly understood that the written constitution was as much a part of the resolution as was the episcopacy, for it was stated that bishops would have no authority save that given to them by the constitution and that they would rule "constitutionally in accordance with a written constitution."

The two other difficulties that have arisen pertain especially to the questions of the ministry and intercommunion. These have given a good deal of trouble and the committee has had to reconsider them several times. At first it seemed as though no better way could be found than that of a dual ministry not equally recognized in all parts of the church. Then the com-

mittee suggested a commissioning service which would enable all to accept all ministers. But some said this was too much like reordination and therefore could not be accepted; while others said it was not at all like ordination and *therefore* could not be accepted. But in the sixth and seventh meetings of the joint committee it is believed that a way has been found whereby all ministers ordained before the union can be accepted as ministers of the word and sacraments throughout the whole church. The only proviso that is made is that no person shall be required to accept the services of a minister contrary to the dictates of his conscience. It is felt, however, that there will be little practical difficulty regarding this matter, for it is the intention of the uniting churches to become an Episcopal Church and therefore in the course of time all the ministers ordained within the church will be episcopally ordained.

In a former meeting it was suggested that, after a period of fifty years, no minister who was not episcopally ordained should minister in the church, but it was soon recognized on all sides that this was neither fair to the ministers nor to the church itself. So in the seventh meeting of the committee it was voted to recommend that it should be recognized that the resultant church would have power to deal with this matter and that after thirty years it should itself decide what its attitude should be to missionaries and others coming from other churches.

With regard to the question of intercommunion the committee is recommending that every church member shall continue to have, after union, every right and privilege that he had before union with reference to this matter. It is, of course, understood that each member of the whole church will be free to communicate in any church of the united church. Ministers will also retain all rights that they had before union. These rights pertain to intercelebration as well as intercommunion. Inasmuch as there are no bodies in South India at present that are in intercommunion with the churches that are negotiating for union except two rather small groups, it means that practically all will be in the united church and that therefore this

question will have largely disappeared. It is also hoped that the groups not now in the negotiations will soon come in so that practically all Protestants in the area affected will be in the resultant church except the Baptists and Lutherans. And union with them is also definitely kept in mind.

The united church will recognize the Apostles' and Nicene creeds as containing "a sufficient statement of the faith for a basis of union." It is recognized that "the manner in which men accept the church's standard of faith varies with their spiritual capacity and experience and such variety is not incompatible with fitness for the discharge of the duties of the ministry." But it is agreed that at least a sincere belief in the truths enunciated in the Nicene creed will be required of candidates for ordination. But it is also recognized that no acceptance of a written creed is sufficient without an inward and personal experience of union with God in Christ.

Though it is recognized by all that it will be impossible at this time to prepare a liturgy that would be acceptable to the church, it is hoped that all will grow into a form of worship that will be used in practically all churches. At present liberty will be allowed to all. The present services will all be recognized and churches may continue to use them. Extemporaneous forms will also be permitted and it is hoped that, even where there are set forms of worship, room will be given for "flexibility and spontaneity." Constituent parts of the communion service were approved and it was found that there was already a great deal in common among the various churches.

A new subject dealt with in this seventh meeting (held in Bangalore, June 29-July 4) pertained to the matter of the relation of the resultant church to other churches both in India and elsewhere. It was most heartily voted that the church after union should continue to be in fellowship with the Lambeth Conference of the Anglican Churches, with the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance, with the World Union of Congregational Churches, and with the Ecumenical Conference of Methodist Churches. There is no thought that this united church shall cut itself off from fellowship with any with whom they are now

in fellowship. Nay rather it was definitely voted "that all the actions of the united church will be regulated by the principle that it should maintain fellowship with all those branches of the church of Christ with which the uniting churches now severally enjoy such fellowship, and that it should constantly seek to strengthen this fellowship and to work toward the full union in one body of all parts of the church of Christ."

A serious difficulty still unsolved is that of the relation of the resultant church to the Church of England in India. The "Indian Church Measure" which has given independence to the church of India, Burmah, and Ceylon contains a clause dealing with members of the Church of England temporarily living in India and guarantees to them the services of the Church of England, including the use of the Book of Common Prayer. It is not yet clear just what can be done to meet the requirement of this legal relationship, but some way must be found within the resultant church or else some arrangement must be made by which the Metropolitan can continue to look after these affairs in South India. It is devoutly hoped, however, that some means may be found within the resultant church to take care of this matter, for it is not desired that there should be any racial distinction in the church in South India.

Several other problems dealing with practical matters, like the number and size of dioceses, the order of the diaconate, the governing bodies of the church, the powers of the bishops, voting by houses, confirmation, etc., etc., were discussed and referred to a continuation committee for further study and report. Another meeting of the joint committee will be held in March, 1929, when it is hoped that a complete scheme for the union of these churches may be drafted for presentation to the churches for final approval. Should the draft meet with such approval it is confidently hoped that the actual consummation of union may take place soon after 1932.

In connection with the inauguration of the union, one matter that is receiving careful study is that of the participation of presbyters (ministers) of the S.I.U.C. and the Wesleyan Church in the consecration of the first new bishops. It

is desired that continuity with the historic episcopate shall be maintained and it is also desired that the bishops of the resultant church shall continue in their ministry the ministry of the Congregational, Presbyterian, and Wesleyan churches which enter into the union with a portion of the Anglican Church. This would make the ministry of the united church an inclusive and thoroughly representative ministry. But it is realized that further study must be given this matter.

Though the joint committee has thus been able to agree on practically all problems that have come before it, and though that committee believes that the various branches of the church of Christ concerned in the negotiations should be able to unite on the basis of their resolutions, it quite sees the probability that some will not see these matters in the same light as they have done and it is therefore quite prepared to have the churches suggest further revision, where desired, and it will continue in prayer and labor until it finds the way that is acceptable to all the churches concerned. For the committee believes that God is in this movement and that therefore His will will finally be found and obeyed. Earnest prayer is solicited, on the part of all Christians throughout the world, that these negotiations may succeed.

JOHN J. BANNINGA.

LIFE AND CREEDS

I never asked what was his cult or creed;
I only knew his life — I saw the deed!
A product of the schools, he had an art
Schools could not give — a secret of the heart.

Far greater than his knowledge or his skill,
The spirit of the man was there — good will,
The grace of kindness, tact, and sympathy,
High courage, patience, rugged honesty.

Why should I care about his cult or creed?
He was a man of God — the kind we need.

—*Edward A. G. Hermann.*

FROM LAUSANNE TO MAIN STREET

BY REV. FRED SMITH

Minister of the First Congregational Church, Newton, Kansas

BETWEEN the stately, venerable, seven-century-old cathedral of Lausanne, wherein recently met the delegates to the World Conference on Faith and Order, and the often unornamented frame structure called "The First Church" of this or that denomination situated on Main Street, there might seem little in common to the casual observer. Sometimes the casual observer is right. In this case he is only partly so. But even that is too much. He ought to be proved wholly wrong. It is to be feared, however, that the opinion of the casual observer in this matter approximates rather closely to the view of the average church member, and, what is more significant, to that of some prominent religionists.

In my ministry I have often found the incidental inexact terminology of some of my parishioners to have a virtue even in its vagueness. The fact that they have never come to clear-cut discrimination with regard to some of the elementary alignments of Christian thinking makes one wish to read to them the epistle to the Hebrews. More times than I care to count have I had church members refer to members of some other branch of the Christian Church as members of another "religion." Perhaps some of them meant it that way. Clear visioned men have more than once had to declare of this or that supposed branch of the church "thou hast a name that thou livest, and art dead." On the other hand, I rather suspect that many of my friends who speak of members of other churches as members of other "religions" are vaguely minded rather than clear visioned.

For those of us who have a keen desire for Christian unity and union it is easy to discount these vaguely reached opinions. Making our wish for unity and union father to the thought

helps us in this respect. But a different situation faces us when we find such a discerning thinker as L. P. Jacks becoming the editor of a series of handbooks on *The Faiths: Varieties of Christian Expression*. It is a significant title, and the volumes already published indicate that it will be a significant series. With the substance of these volumes we have here no concern. The important fact for us is that, in spite of some hesitancy, the eminent editor of this series should give to them the general title: *The Faiths*. And this just when the long prepared for conference at Lausanne was to be held! It is a fact worthy of note for those who attended Lausanne and those who remained on Main Street. In passing, it might be said that it indicates that we are at once nearer to each other and farther apart from each other than we perhaps had thought. The venerable Gore might remind us of the common basis to be found in the Nicene creed, but the fighting Barnes wants to know something about our common attitude to modern science. Ancient creeds conceived in and through a metaphysic unrelated to the laboratory are now to prove their worth in confronting a pragmatism evolved in an age of experimental research. College, seminary, and university are working toward a new evaluation with Lausanne and Main Street listening in. Both are liable to hear something of worth. Meanwhile, what of Christian unity and union?

Lausanne has spoken; Main Street has listened—in a way. I did not go to Lausanne. But I keyed in on Lausanne with attentive ear. I have read much concerning the conference there. I owed it to myself and to my people. I have some notions as to how Lausanne thinks of Main Street but, so far as this article is concerned, they are for myself alone. The important thing is to know how Main Street regards Lausanne. As a straw shows which way the wind blows so incidental episodes have a meaning beyond themselves. Let me instance two. To our city there recently came a denominational state convention. The preacher of the convention sermon undertook to give a résumé of the World Conference on Faith and Order held at Lausanne. Leaving the building with a man and his

wife I heard her say to him: "What was the place where this conference was held?" He replied (having heard only part of the address) "I don't know, but I guess it was Los Angeles." A few weeks later in my evening sermon I made reference to the Lausanne Conference. After the service two young ladies, visitors unknown to me, stayed to ask me where this Lausanne was, as they also had heard the address at the convention a few weeks earlier. I am inclined to think that these two episodes illustrate only too well the attitude of Main Street to Lausanne. And it knew less about Stockholm.

Perhaps it is not very important that Main Street think deeply about Lausanne or Stockholm as events. It is important that they be regarded as symbols. More important is the fact that each community itself become a Lausanne and a Stockholm. Here in our city of 10,000, no worse, but rather thinking ourselves somewhat better, than the average community, we have twenty-one churches and twenty-one preachers and twenty-one parsonages. This is not the worst yet. I have ministered in a town of seven hundred where we had six churches with six ministers and six parsonages. My Christianity is still sore from that experience.

It is a matter of regret to me that I am not alone in such an experience. Let me quote a few sentences from a "message" of a state superintendent of a denomination in this Middle West. I know him to be long-suffering in regard to this matter of Christian union and unity. He quotes a long paragraph concerning the matter of Christian unity which he had read in the organ of a sister denomination. I give the last sentence of it to reveal the substance of it. "Matters have now reached such a stage," it says, "that denominations will either have to begin to act on this question of union or else keep still about it." The superintendent I have mentioned then goes on to make this comment: "We heartily endorse this fine paragraph. In Kansas up to now, Christian unity has been all 'talk,' especially on the part of the denominations most definitely committed to church unity." Perhaps Main Street is not thinking much of Lausanne or Stockholm, because it is hard for some people when very sick to think about anybody else but themselves.

But does Main Street know that it is sick? Some laymen do and some preachers do, but the ratio of the former is greater than that of the latter. You see preachers have convictions to be maintained. They say "We have a law." But the laymen, not being disciplined very deeply to a stereotyped creed, are willing to live according to a matured common sense. And they seek the uplands of fellowship in Rotary and similar organizations, meanwhile overlooking Lausanne, for their appointed leader did not have much of an eye for these things, anyhow. Protestantism, by its own genius, has created its own problems. We have now come to see that in the past those who were accounted leaders came to give an undue emphasis to the points of difference between the sects. They specialized on fences, not on a common faith. The minister of to-day had better give his attention to that of gateways. He should make his pulpit the place of the interpreter. The secular press could do more than it does in this matter, but its publicists are not persuaded that this would be "news"; the religious press is doing much along this line, but the religious press is not widely read by the laity. For the time being the key man in this situation is the minister. It is not required that he bring all that was said at Lausanne to his people. That might be the height of unwisdom. But he can bring all the lessons of Lausanne. This is his great privilege and opportunity.

The minister who seeks to broaden the basis of Christian fellowship will soon find he is attempting no easy task. Measured by any way the distance from Lausanne to Main Street is no small way. And some of us, looking at the "findings" of that conference are persuaded that the distance from Lausanne to the kingdom of God is still great. But it is on the way. And the churches, having made a cult of provincialism, still know not the highway, because they have in their own local field a blind leader of the blind. That this has been an occasion for tragedy one can easily prove in our time. Battered and bruised by a world conflict, we have heard men and statesmen speak of a league of nations. But there can be no effective league of peoples until there is a genuine league of the churches. The

intent of the conference at Lausanne was to make this ideal more nearly an accomplished fact. Main Street needs not only to know this but to appreciate it. Once she comes to have ears for this matter she will come to have a voice also. Already there are many signs that intelligent laymen are beginning to query our present system and methods. They see too much duplication of activity leading oftentimes, on the part of ecclesiastical leaders, to something which seems to savor of duplicity.

The problem of world church union and unity is so big that the pastor on Main Street sometimes feels his littleness so keenly as to allow it to neutralize his activity. Because he cannot go to Lausanne he forthwith proceeds to do nothing. He gets the inferiority complex. Possibly he reads Sinclair Lewis. He comforts himself with the belief that he is not in a strategic position. He gets that curious and unchristian philosophic outlook which believes in the importance of high places to the forgetting of the value of the lowly places. Opportunity is not an aristocratic privilege. It is a democratic thing. It companies with men of all talents and of all degrees. It abides on Main Street as well as at Lausanne. In other words, it calls upon the minister on Main Street to make of his community a little Lausanne in the best sense of the word. If such a pastor can become instrumental in getting the laymen of that town or village to forget their provincialities for a season in a "layman's get-together"; if by tact and persuasion he can enable them to quit confusing their idiosyncrasies with the fact of their ideals, he will have accomplished something which may not "go down in history," but he will have achieved that which will be written in a book of remembrance up in heaven. Of these two I rather think the latter is the more important. Brother of mine, I wish you well in this work.

FRED SMITH.

SHOULD CHURCHES UNITE—NOW?

BY REV. ARTHUR JUDSON BROWN, D. D.

General Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., New York

CHURCH union is now a major subject. The findings of the World Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne are being considered by all the ninety participating churches. I write of the conditions that render consideration urgent. I shall write frankly and without expectation of unanimous approval. My views attract some good judges and distract others equally good. If any readers shall not agree with me, I assure them that they will be in excellent company.

But whatever the differences of method, surely all will agree that the movement toward closer union of Christians is one of the most significant movements of the century. It is high time. The United States census lists 212 denominations. We need not concern ourselves with religious freaks. As long as we have religious liberty and as long as there are peculiar people there will probably be such religious aberrations as the Duck River and Kindred Association Baptists, the Two-Seed in-the-Spirit Predestinarians, and like groups. Nor need we waste time over the type of people who on Sunday mornings love to congregate in hotel ballrooms and listen open-mouthed to cloudy metaphysics and denatured Christianity. We may dismiss a whole brood of such sects as insects.

But consider the main denominational divisions. There are nine denominations of the Presbyterian and Reformed faith and order, fourteen of Baptists, fifteen of Methodists, and eighteen of Lutherans. Even the peaceable Quakers are divided into four bodies and the Church of the Living God, in spite of its title, is split into three communions. Over-churched communities are on every side. A Missouri village of 300 people has six denominational churches. An Illinois town of 1500 people has nine denominations. A Vermont town of 3,500 has thirteen. A Pennsylvania town of 8,000 has three Presbyterian

churches, three United Presbyterian, three Methodist, two Episcopalian, and one Disciples.

We gladly recognize that each of the principal denominations arose to witness to some truth which had been obscured. But a glance at the present situation will reveal the fact that the vital things for which each of the great communions stands are now accepted by practically all communions. Let us test this by a few examples.

In an age when the Roman Catholic Church claimed that salvation lay only within its pale, that the priest mediated between the worshiper and God, and that the pope held the keys of heaven and hell, Presbyterians arose to assert that God alone is the author of salvation, that the believer has immediate access to Him without the intervention of a priest, and that the church should be governed by representatives elected by the people. Are these tenets distinctively Presbyterian to-day? Every well-informed person knows that they are common to all evangelical communions.

In an age of the union of church and state, when citizenship gave membership in the church, irrespective of faith and life, Baptists arose to insist that the true church is composed only of those who have personally accepted Christ, and that the church so constituted should be independent of the state. Splendid has been the witness of the Baptist communion to these great principles. Large is the indebtedness of the whole Christian world to this witness bearing. But that battle has been won and all other communions are enjoying the fruits of the victory. These principles are now no more distinctively Baptist than Methodist or Congregational. Communions which baptize infants do not admit them to the Lord's supper until, after having attained years of discretion, the children have made personal confession of faith.

In an age of ecclesiastical tyranny, when the right of private judgment was denied, when no man was free to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience, and when a believer at variance with the established church was in danger of imprisonment, Congregationalists arose to proclaim intellectual freedom, the inherent right of man to determine for himself

how he should worship God and interpret the Scriptures, and the inalienable privilege of every congregation to manage its own affairs without dictation from ecclesiastical hierarchs. Noble has been the testimony of the Congregational churches to this declaration of religious liberty. Their successful struggle has made all Christians their debtors. But their battle, too, has been won, and the results are the heritage of all their sister churches. Every communion is now intellectually free. Every local congregation has an effective voice in the management of its own affairs. Episcopal and Methodist bishops are elected by the people, or their chosen representatives, and are vested only with those powers which the people desire them to have in the interest of the common good.

In an age of spiritual deadness and fox-hunting parsons, when the poor did not have the Gospel preached unto them and religion was a matter of ceremonies and outward conformity, Methodists arose to preach an evangelical Gospel, to revise a spiritual faith, and to insist that the vital thing in religion is not the presence of one's name on the roll of a church but a real experience of Christ. Immense is the indebtedness of Christianity to the zeal and devotion of the Methodists. Wesley and his successors, from the pioneer circuit riders to the present day bishops and pastors, have powerfully strengthened the religious life of the world. But are their original characteristics now distinctive of the Methodist Church to any greater degree than of other churches? Name the greatest preachers of this generation, inquire which communions are manifesting the greatest evangelistic zeal, and one will find himself in a company which knows no denominational lines.

Does the Anglican communion present an illustration of the same kind? It has been flippantly said that the Church of England consisted of those who were left after the others had gone out, although the going was not in every case a direct departure. But all the spiritually minded men and women did not go out. Many remained in the church of their fathers to work and pray with redoubled vigor for the purity of its faith and the spirituality of its activities. The Church of England, startled and spurred to new effort by the heavy defections from

its membership and becoming responsive to the rising spirit of the age, threw off abuses and turned itself, with new devotion, to the real work of the Master until it became what it and the Protestant Episcopal Church in America are to-day — a communion which exalts the dignity of the house of God, the reverence of worship, the significance of the sacraments, and whose clergy are as active and earnest as any in the world in self-denying labor among all classes.

I do not claim that I have adequately summarized the positions of the communions that have been named. But perhaps enough has been said to emphasize the point that the vital things for which each of the great communions historically stood are now the common possession of other communions, so that the former necessity for their separate existence no longer exists. "These various denominational forms of the living church," said Dr. A. A. Hodge, "are all one in their essentials, and differ only in their accidents." Then why remain apart? I once heard an eminent minister name "three vital characteristics" of his denomination. These he gave as "first, a profound reverence for personality; second, the centrality of those elements in Christianity which can be experienced in the whole soul of man; and third, the reality of divine grace available to man from the foundation of the world yet historical and visual in Christ." He proceeded to declare that "should ——— abdicate their position, God would simply raise up another and truer generation for the maintenance and propagation of those truths."

I challenge any one to identify that communion from this description of its "distinctive" position.

That the church of our time is facing new emergencies was frankly stated by Dr. Francis L. Patten, then president of Princeton Theological Seminary, who said in his centennial sermon, May 5, 1912: "I am very free to admit that the issues of to-day are different from those of a former generation. . . . The things wherein we agree with our brethren of other Christian communions are the more important than those in which we differ. . . . The points which distinguish our theology are not necessarily those of greatest controversial importance at the

present day. Men are not discussing the question regarding the subjects or the mode of baptism. The day of hot controversy between Calvinists and Arminians has passed. Men are not writing treatises on theories of inspiration. They are not discussing the question of Adamic relationship or of this, that, and the other view of the atonement. The reason is not that these questions are of no importance or of little importance — though I think there is far too much indifference to their significance — but to the fact that the thought of the theological world is occupied with questions which bear more radically upon the truth and value of historic Christianity.”

It is clear that the path to unity does not lead backward to the centuries of separation, does not lie in effort to transplant ourselves to the days of our forefathers and to fight over again the battles which they fought. We shall never get anywhere by reopening old controversies. That would only revivify a sectarian spirit that is rapidly dying and ought to be allowed to do so. Let us ungrudgingly say that each of the great historic communions was historically justified in the position that it originally took; that each emphasized truths that needed to be emphasized; and that each has borne useful testimony to the truth for which it arose so that the church universal is far richer than it would have been if the denominations had never arisen.

But unstinted gratitude for the blessings which the controversies of former generations have brought does not require us to fight over again the battles of the past. Each communion has now succeeded in so indoctrinating common Christianity with its essential message that there is no longer necessity for it to stand apart in order to be loyal to its historic position. Seldom does a sermon in any church contain anything that would enable a stranger to tell the denomination to which the preacher belongs.

It is well known, however, that some denominations did not arise in the ways that have been indicated. Presbyterian and Reformed churches developed as separate denominations not because of differences or to witness to truths that had been obscured but because the founders of some came from Scotland

and Ireland, others from Holland, and others from Germany. Why should their descendants of later generations of the same faith and order perpetuate these divisions? And what of the denominations that originated in quarrels? They are to be found in hundreds of communities. Many denominational traditions are sacred, but others are merely embalmed prejudices. The climax is reached by the denomination which Dr. Henry van Dyke says was divided into two sects by the preference of one branch for hooks and eyes instead of buttons in the attachment of clothing. Why should the Civil War, sixty years ago, still divide American Presbyterians? Why should a converted Hindu in India be called an American Methodist or a Scotch Presbyterian? Imagine a Dutch Reformed Chinese! To assert that it is the will of God that the followers of Christ should be split into scores of denominations, competing, overlapping, quadrupling machinery and quartering influence is — well, I hesitate to characterize it.

Happily a better day has now dawned. There is a larger conception of the work of the church at home and abroad; a realization that resources are limited and that even if they were not we have no right to squander them in denominational rivalry. There is a growing spirit of brotherhood. Churches cannot preach the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, and the universality of the Gospel up and down the land and throughout the earth without creating a spirit of unity which demands more concrete expression than it has yet received.

There is, too, a growing conviction that the foes of Christ are so formidable that His disciples must unite against them. Materialism, agnosticism, rationalism, the world, the flesh, and the devil were never so aggressive as to-day. As in two visits to Asia I looked upon the swarming myriads who know not God, I became convinced that a divided church can never save the world. Indeed it is not saving America. It is notorious that the churches are not adequately meeting the conditions of American life. One of the dominant notes at the Lausanne Conference was the note of urgency, that something simply must be done and without further delay if this situation is to be adequately met.

It is amazing that any should say that union would jeopardize truth, amazing that any should not see that it is necessary to preserve truth. Have we a Bible that is the word of God, the only infallible rule of faith and practice? Have we a Christ who is the Lord and Savior of men? Have we a Gospel which we believe with St. Paul to be "the power of God unto salvation?" Surely then all who believe these truths should stand together in witnessing to them. There must be joy in the infernal regions when men who imagine that they are doing God's service insist upon perpetuating sectarian divisions.

And there is a clearer realization that these divisions do not accord with the mind of Christ. I do not profess to know more about Him than my brethren. I humbly confess that I know less than many of them. But I remember His own words. Did He not pray "that they may all be one"? Did He not say that "there shall be one fold and one shepherd"? I once heard a minister argue that this statement is consistent with many denominational flocks. The good man evidently knew more about denominations than he did about sheep. If a shepherd divides his flock it is not because of differences between the sheep but because one enclosure is not large enough to hold them all. If there are too many Christians in a given town to be accommodated in one edifice, or if they are too widely scattered to make it practicable for them to reach it, of course a second or third "flock" should be formed. But this is merely the parish system within a single communion, and it affords no parallel to a division into several denominations of Christians who could easily form one flock. Some commentators hold that our Lord's words refer to an ethical and inward unity rather than to an outward uniformity. But I am not advocating uniformity, but a corporate union which is the natural expression of inward unity. Can it be seriously argued that Christ's disciples have "inward unity" if they refuse to unite and build half a dozen denominational churches where one would suffice?

After I had expressed this opinion in an address, a friend argued that our Lord told His followers that they should be one even as He and the Father are one, and that as the Son and the Father were not one body, neither were believers to be. Are

we then to conclude that the distinction between Christ and the Father is analogous to the distinction between Methodists and Baptists, or Congregationalists and Episcopalians, and that Christians may be one even as the Father and the Son are one and still insist upon going their independent ways even to worshipping apart and, in some instances, refusing to commune together? Such an emasculation of the natural meaning of our Lord's words come perilously near to travesty. After a minister had argued that the prayer of Christ that His disciples might be one was consistent with denominational separations, a little girl naively asked her mother: "Mamma, if Jesus didn't mean what He said, why didn't He say what He meant?"

"But we must follow conscience," some object. Of course, but let us be sure that conscience is right. Many false faiths are supported by conscientious men. If one has a conscience which keeps him aloof from his fellow Christians it might be well to examine it upon his knees. A vast amount of unregenerate pugnacity passes for conscientious convictions. When a deputation told Oliver Cromwell that it was the will of God that he should take a certain course, he replied: "I beseech you by the mercies of God, remember it is possible you may be mistaken." Convictions that separate us from our fellow Christians may have a larger element of misunderstanding and human frailty than we suspect. We shall not get very far on the road to the unity for which Christ prayed until each of us prayerfully asks himself whether it is probable that the Christ who promised to be with His disciples "always," and the holy Spirit who was to "guide" them "into all the truth," made a particular group of believers the only recipient of these divine blessings, so that the only way to unite the followers of Christ is for all the others to give up their own ideas and come over to his communion.

I am happy in saying that union has gone much farther on the foreign mission field than it has at home. In every non-Christian land where the missionaries of the Presbyterian and Reformed faith and order work, organic union has already been achieved. In like manner, Northern and Southern Methodists, still separate in America, are united on the mission field. In

some lands, of which China and India are examples, union has included most of the denominations. Missionary boards are pushing union and coöperation as fast as their home constituencies will permit them.

Unity does not involve compromise of anything really essential. I have no sympathy with an effort to attain unity by watering down or ignoring truth. I stand unreservedly for what the Lausanne Conference happily and unanimously termed "the church's common confession of faith," "the faith which is proclaimed in the holy Scriptures and is witnessed to and safeguarded in the ecumenical creed commonly called the Nicene, and in the Apostles' creed, which is continuously confirmed in the spiritual experience of the church of Christ." Within the area of that faith, let us rid ourselves of the utterly false notion that uniformity is essential to union. This mistaken notion has worked some havoc, splitting the followers of Christ into hundreds of sects. The New Testament shows that there was not uniformity in the early church, and we know that there is not uniformity in the Protestant churches of to-day. Uniformity may be Roman Catholic; it is not Protestant. It is significant that the lines of cleavage do not run vertically between denominations; they run horizontally through denominations. It was interesting to note at Lausanne that the only real controversy was not between denominational groups but within the delegation of a single communion, the Anglican. Let us agree to differ in non-essentials and seek unity in essentials. If we are not sure whether we are agreed in essentials, let us get together and find out. The obstacles that were stressed by some delegates of one or two communions at Lausanne related to such questions of order as apostolic succession, ordination, etc. But why defer the union of a majority of denominations that are not divided on these issues because a minority deem them vital? It is futile to imagine that universal union will come by a single, all-inclusive act at one time. It will come in a series of unions as two or more churches find the way clear. All unions that have been formed thus far have come about in this way, as, for example, in Canada, China, and India. Negotiations for several other unions are now well advanced in

America, England, and Scotland. Men who assert that union is impracticable under present conditions should open their eyes to what is going on around them.

Was the Lausanne Conference a success? It is being decried by those who did not want it to succeed and by those who innocently imagined that the divisions of three hundred years could be healed in nineteen days. But the conference was not intended to unite denominations. It had no power to do so. It was not a legislative body but a conference. As a conference it was a notable success. It showed that a large measure of unity already prevails. What Locarno did to the political atmosphere of Europe, Lausanne did to the religious atmosphere of the world. Some things will be possible now that were not possible before. Those who attended that conference can never forget its spirit of fellowship and prayer. We realized anew that Christ is not a sectarian Christ or a national Christ, but a world Christ, and that the better we understand Him the better we shall understand one another. Lausanne, too, gave us a more vivid impression of the vitality of the church. When five hundred delegates representing ninety denominations journey from twenty-six countries over continents and oceans to spend nineteen days in conference over the urgent needs of the church of God, surely the churches which they represent are not decadent or asleep.

It was inspiring to see men of many lands emerge from the thickets of misunderstanding into the open sunlit spaces of a common fellowship; inspiring, if I may adapt Walt Whitman's *Song of the Open Road*, to see the grand road of God's universe plain before us, to mingle with the procession of saintly souls upon it, "to gather the minds of men out of their brains as you encounter them," and best of all "to gather the love out of their hearts." Never again can I think of other churches merely as great ecclesiastical bodies of different traditions and organizations. Rather do I think of them in terms of the beautiful Christian characters I have learned to know and love—men like the Greek Germanos and Alivisatos, the German Lutheran Deissmann and Simons, the French Reformed Monod, the American Episcopalian Brent, the English Congregational-

ist Garvie, the Anglican Gore and Winchester, the Swedish Lutheran Söderblom, and scores of others, men who walk with God and who have daily audience with Him.

So after Lausanne I face the future with new confidence. I do not underestimate the obstacles yet to be surmounted. While some unions have already been achieved, others are in process of formation, and the whole movement has been accelerated, I realize that there may be a long road to travel before the prayer of our Lord will be fulfilled. Some of us will not live to see it. But the end is not doubtful. In spite of the opposition of some and the indifference of others, what is now a glorious vision will ultimately become a glorious reality. Is union impossible, as some assert? I reply that nothing that is right is impossible, that nothing that Christ desires His disciples to do is incapable of accomplishment. If I may adapt the words of Gladstone in his great speech on the Reform Bill in the British Parliament, "Time is on our side. The great spiritual forces which are moving onward in their might and in their majesty, and which the tumult of this present time can neither impede nor disturb, these forces are on our side. And though there may be hours during which our banner shall droop over sinking hearts, there will come again a time when it will float again in the eye of heaven, and be borne onward to a certain, and perhaps to a not distant victory."

"In Him there is no east nor west,
In Him no south nor north,
But one great fellowship of love
Throughtout the whole wide earth.
In Him shall true hearts everywhere
Their high communion find;
His service is the golden cord
Close binding all mankind."

ARTHUR JUDSON BROWN.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

The San Francisco Conference

As an outcome of the recent letter sent out by the continuation committee of the Lausanne Conference, asking for suggestions as to the "next steps to be taken in forwarding the movement toward Christian unity," an informal conference was held in San Francisco on June 7. The conference was attended by representatives of all of the larger communions and aroused the keenest interest. So many questions and plans were brought up which could not be adequately considered that it was unanimously decided to have an extended conference of several days early in the autumn.

A communion service was held in Grace Cathedral to which all members of the conference were invited. The morning session was held in the headquarters of the Presbyterian Church, San Francisco. Dr. John E. Stuchell, moderator of the San Francisco presbytery, was elected chairman, and the Rev. Britton D. Weigle, secretary of the diocese of California, was elected secretary.

The morning session began with the presentation of reviews of movements toward Christian unity. Dr. Lynn White, professor of social ethics in the Presbyterian Seminary at San Anselmo, gave a most interesting account of the Stockholm Conference. Dr. White showed the immense contribution which such conferences made toward Christian unity. Theological controversy alone will not bring about Christian unity. Dr. White said that "theological discussion is the favorite indoor sport of parsons." But the real challenge is the ethical test of Christianity. That test will unite the real followers of Christ in a deep bond of sacrificial fellowship. We should be ashamed of the way the leadership in this direction has been taken in the foreign field. If we only could catch the challenge of a world peace as the way of Christ, we could forget many of our superficial differences and lay them at the foot of the Cross.

Bishop Parsons followed with a review of the Lausanne Conferences. The bishop showed clearly that the objective of that conference was limited to certain results, chiefly to get at the facts, both of agreement and of difference. Those who were

impatient because things were not done forgot the purpose of the conference. The conference brought out the fact that the things that unite the communions were far greater than the things that separate them. Each group learned to study and to understand the viewpoint of the others. In this way the Protestant and the Catholic positions were not antithetic but complimentary.

Dr. Herman F. Swartz, president of the Pacific Theological Seminary, who was a delegate to Lausanne from the Congregational Church, gave a pointed and witty picture of the Lausanne Conference. He agreed with Bishop Parsons that the things that unite were far more important than the things which separate. He said that we have all lost the historic practice of "sending men to hell with great unction." Our differences are secondary and consist chiefly in political, cultural, and national differences of environment." Dr. Swartz described the two chief groups at Lausanne, one representing the traditional and institutional, and the other the experimental and individual approach. He said that these two can be correlated in a unity with large diversity. Dr. Swartz then reviewed the findings of the recent Baltimore Conference, and concluded by stating that the greatest present need is the prophetic leadership which will make courageous experiments in manifesting the real unity which exists in many communities. We need laboratory experiments in local fields.

Dr. M. H. Alexander, president of the San Francisco Church Federation, reviewed the wonderful growth of the Federal Council of Churches in America and showed how its work helped the various communions to know and to understand one another. Dr. Alexander also spoke of the proposed advance toward Christian unity which will be taken up at the next national council meeting in Rochester.

At the luncheon meeting an informal discussion was held and a further review of some of the results of some local conferences were presented.

In the afternoon session the topic was: "What Is the Next Step in Forwarding the Christian Unity Movement?" This topic was presented by prominent leaders representing all of the larger denominations. Dr. John W. Bailey, professor of New Testament Literature in the Baptist Theological Seminary, spoke from the point of view of a Baptist. Dr. L. G. Leavitt spoke from the point of view of the Church of the Disciples. The Rev. W. L. Wood, professor of theology in the

Church Divinity School of the Pacific, spoke from the point of view of an Episcopalian. The chairman, the Rev. Dr. Werlein, superintendent for the Methodist Church (South), said that he could say "Amen" to all that Mr. Wood said.

The Rev. Dr. Robert E. Brown, pastor of the First Congregational Church, Oakland, stirred the conference with a prophetic address in which he presented a definite concrete plan for an immediate fellowship for a United Christian Church in which the members do not relinquish their present denominational membership. It would be based on the common fundamental principles of the Christian faith. He closed with the words: "Brethren, the next step is to step."

The Rev. Ernest A. Trabert, of Berkeley, spoke from the point of view of a Lutheran.

Bishop Parsons read a letter from Bishop Alexy of the Greek Orthodox Church in which it was recommended that the next step toward Christian unity was to study the history of the original, united church and the schisms from it. That would lead us to the true church of Christ.

Dr. Frank P. Flegal, a superintendent of the Methodist Church and an active worker for Christian unity, spoke from the Methodist point of view. Dr. Hugh W. Gilchrist spoke from the point of view of a Presbyterian.

The report of the findings committee, Dr. Dennett, editor of the *California Methodist Advocate*, Dr. Gilcrest, and the Rev. B. D. Weigle, editor of the *Pacific Churchman*, was as follows:

1. We recommend that a more extended conference be held in the autumn, said conference to include representatives of the laity, both men and women, and the youth of our churches. Dr. Brown's resolutions to be on the agenda for this conference.

2. The immediate unity of kindred denominations as far as practicable.

3. The interchange of information through the denominational press and literature.

4. The promotion of the will to Christian unity in each denomination and congregation by inspirational and educational methods.

5. A closer coöperation in the training for the ministry, including definite knowledge of the point of view of other denominations than one's own.

6. We are convinced that the time has come for definite adventures in Christian unity in local areas.

Owing to the lateness of the hour many had to leave and the report was referred to the later conference for final adoption.

While a considerable part of the conference was devoted to the recapitulation of past movements toward Christian unity, or "threshing out old straw," as one member put it, it

provided a splendid background for the formulation of a practical program in the near future.

A real step forward has been made and the prospects are most encouraging. We are looking forward to the autumn conference with intense eagerness.

[From Rev. B. D. Weigle in *The Churchman*, New York.]

American Protestants Getting Together

SIGNS multiply that we are entering upon an era of new interest in Christian unity and of new faith in the possibility of a more united Church. Consider the recent General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. What a creative movement history may show it to have been when that great gathering manifested an enthusiastic response to the suggestion of a union with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. In fact, church unity was one of the dominant issues of the conference. With but little discussion, a resolution was adopted, the effect of which was to place the Methodist Episcopal Church squarely in favor of union with the Presbyterian communion. The vote stood 852 in favor of the resolution and 3 against it — virtually unanimous.

The significance of the action taken at Kansas City was clearly understood by the delegate members of the General Conference. "There are vast reaches and important implications in this action," said President Daniel Marsh of Boston University, "it doubtless will be a long time before Christianity is united, but it never will be accomplished without some great denomination faring forth with friendly overtures."

A commission of 37 members, including 7 bishops, 15 ministers, and 15 laymen, was appointed to represent the Methodist Church in all matters pertaining to coöperation and unity. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., meeting in Tulsa, Oklahoma, then authorized the creation of a committee to meet with the Methodist commission to discuss, during the next twelve months, the terms on which the two churches might be brought together.

Consider, also, what is happening in the Congregational body in its relation to sister communions. A definite plan for union with the Christian Church has been prepared, which is ready for submission to both sides. Other proposals have visualized the possibility of union of the Congregationalists and the Universalists. Still further, there has just been a joint meeting of the New York Congregational Conference and the New

Jersey Christian Missionary Society (Disciples) at which the question of union between Disciples and Congregationalists came to the fore.

Against such a background, the future of the whole enterprise of federating the Christian forces in an ever closer fellowship takes on fresh meaning and greatly enhanced possibilities. What has already been achieved raises the question whether the time has not now come for a decided advance toward the realization of the larger possibilities implicit in the federation movement.

To the study of this question all the morning sessions of the coming quadrennial meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches, to be held in Rochester, December 5-12, will be devoted. Three major issues are raised, seeking an answer to the questions (1) whether we should be satisfied with coöperation; or (2) whether we should now seek to develop the church federation movement into a *federal union*, in which the churches retain their independent authority and responsibility in large areas of work but delegate certain defined functions to the federal body, and (3) what we can learn from the movements that are seeking to unite all the churches into one body with one central organization.

The discussions provoked by these inquiries should determine with a fair degree of accuracy the extent to which the American churches are prepared to go in their desire for a closer integration of their forces. The meeting at Rochester, which will be the twentieth anniversary of the creation of the Federal Council, should reveal how much Christian unity is now possible and what actual forms it should take.

[From *Federal Council Bulletin*, New York.]

Unity by the Way of Spiritual Loyalty

WE seem inevitably led to conclude that Christian unity must be sought not by the way of intellectual agreement, but by the way of spiritual loyalty; not by concurrence of creeds, but by consecration of life. We turn back to the Master of the Christian faith and find no other unity contemplated or desired by Him. Nothing is more reiterated in His teaching than the summons from external authority to personal obedience; from the legalism of scribes and Pharisees to the spiritual gospel of the kingdom of God. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father." "Many will say to me in that day, Lord,

Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? . . . And then will I say unto them . . . depart from me, ye that work iniquity." "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me." "So shall ye be my disciples." Jesus Christ knew nothing whatever of an organized church, of orders of clergy, or of prescribed sacraments. He had never heard of a Nicene creed, or an ecclesiastical system, or an infallible Bible. If He should give to the world to-day the same teaching that He gave in Palestine, He would not be welcomed as qualified for membership in any one of the great communions which bear His name. He did not come to establish a hierarchy; He came, as was written of Him, to preach the gospel of the kingdom of God. Indeed, as Dean Inge has lately said: "If Jesus had returned to earth in the Middle Ages, He would certainly have been burned alive for denying the doctrines about His own nature." What He wanted of His disciples was obedience, loyalty, decision. "He that willeth to do the will shall know the doctrine."

How obvious all this is, — yes, how universally recognized by unsophisticated minds! Yet how revolutionary it seems in the presence of demands for conformity to propositions which no man can understand, and which even if understood, would not make one a disciple of Jesus Christ. It is with religion as it is with politics. So long as citizens think about politics there are likely to be differing parties; nothing is more improbable than that all voters will become either Republicans or Democrats; controversy about tariff and taxes will continue; but round these divisive political creeds is the environing circle of national loyalty, and there is no controversy about love of country. Parties unite in the catholicity of patriotism and join with equal fervor in their common hymn:

America! America!
 God shed His grace on thee,
 And crown thy good with brotherhood
 From sea to shining sea.

So it is with religion. Round its divisive creeds and sectarian controversies is the comprehensive circle of Christian loyalty, where the prayer of Jesus is fulfilled, and all may be one as He and the Father are one, not by intellectual concurrence but by spiritual affinity.

We look back through the Christian centuries, and see this desire for spiritual unity moving, as one great teacher has said, "like a subterranean stream which gushes up at intervals

through the externalism or formalism of successive ages." "Wherever Christ is," said Ignatius, in the second century, "there is the catholic church." "Wherever the Spirit of God is," said Irenæus a little later, "there is the church and every kind of grace." "The church," said Sebastian Franck in the sixteenth century, "is not a special creed or sect, but a spiritual and invisible body of all members of Christ." "The church," said Phillips Brooks, "is but the type of a complete humanity, — elect, not that it may be saved out of the world, but that the world may be saved through its witness." So the subterranean stream flows through the centuries; and a great teacher of the nineteenth century, James Martineau, writes: "The church is the assemblage of men meaning to be loyal to Christ"; and in the language of the twentieth century, Professor Fosdick announces: "The church is the fellowship of souls who in the spirit have found God. Sometimes one discovers its members inside the visible churches, and sometimes outside." What is all this but to reaffirm the great words of Channing, spoken nearly a century ago, but as timely as if spoken to-day: "There is a grander church than all particular ones, the church catholic or universal. . . . You may exclude me from your Roman Church, your Episcopal Church, and your Calvinistic church; but I will not be severed from the Body of Christ. I belong to the universal church. Nothing shall separate me from it. . . . No man can be excommunicated from it but by himself, by the death of goodness in his own heart." Such is the path to Christian unity of which Whittier sang:

Our Friend, our Brother, and our Lord,
What may thy service be?
Nor name, nor form, nor ritual word,
But simply following Thee.

Does this mean that the institution of the church is superfluous, or that a creed is unimportant? On the contrary, it is inevitable that ideas should be incarnated in institutions, the spirit clothed with flesh. But a church is a means, not an end, and a creed is not a religion, but the best one can think about a religion. Every one has a creed, even if it be only the creed that all creeds are false. To deny one creed is to affirm another, and to have no creed is to confess that one has given up thinking. But a creed is not a religion; it is a scaffolding set up against religion; it is necessary to the building, but may be changed with the building's growth. One might with all sincerity accept almost every article of the historic creeds and not

be really a Christian at all. Christian unity must rest, not on law, but on loyalty; not on identity of opinion, but on discipleship and love.

Suppose, then, that one strikes into this broader path to unity; what will he discover? His first surprise will be to discover the large companionship which he meets; the sense of spiritual unity found with lives whose creed or ritual may be remote from one's own. One may remain a consistent Presbyterian or Anglican or Unitarian, and yet find more genuine affinity with a Quaker or a Catholic than with some of his own communion. Ecclesiastical barriers fall before this touch of spiritual intimacy. A convinced Protestant may find daily food in *Imitation of Christ*. The faith of a devout Anglican may be sustained by the teaching of Fox the Quaker, or of Wesley the Methodist, or of Martineau the Unitarian. Religion takes many forms as human beings have different bodies; but the unity of religion, like the unity of human lives, is not in what the theologians call the body of doctrine, but in the sympathy of souls.

Open your hymn-book, for example, and notice this companionship on almost every page. Side by side in undisguised intimacy stand the hymns of Keble the priest and Hosmer the rationalist and Whittier the Quaker, and worshipping congregations join in singing the words of authors whom they might not tolerate as fellow-worshipers. "Let me make the ballads of a nation," said Fletcher of Saltoun, "and I care not who makes its laws." It is the same with the unity of the hymn-book. Little does a congregation care for the laws which limit its theology when it is released, like a bird from its cage, into the free air of song. I entered one afternoon the Roman Catholic Cathedral on Fifth Avenue, New York, and found the great nave packed with men at a congress of the Knights of Columbus. As I entered, a leaflet was handed to me from which singing had just begun. And what was the hymn in which this great assembly was uniting? It was the "Nearer, my God, to Thee" of Sarah Flower Adams, an English Unitarian. The subterranean stream of the religious life had broken through the restraints even of the Roman hierarchy and had found a way to Christian unity which the church of authority might not advise or even permit one to go.

Across the ages, then, comes once more the prayer of Jesus—that all may be one as He and the Father are one. What is the organization which represents that prayer, and which we call the holy catholic church? It is the fellowship of those who,

under many names, are walking the Christian way. Who belong to that church? Those, answers Jesus, who having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience. How shall we recognize a Christian? By their fruits, answers the Master, ye shall know them. The irrefutable evidence of a life acceptable to Jesus Christ is in the serenity with which it meets the vicissitudes of experience and sanctifies itself for others' sakes. Against such, as the Apostle Paul said, there is no law. What hinders this great consummation? It is the dragging down of religion from the level of an experience to the level of a discussion, from life to logic, from a faith to a form. It is, in short, the low spiritual level on which we are tempted habitually to live. It is the heresy of our worldliness, the sin of our complacency, the small horizon of our desire. Is it easy, then, to be a Christian? On the contrary, it is easier to adore Christ than it is to follow Him; easier to repeat a Christian creed than to create a Christian character; easier to be orthodox than to be Christlike. The Christianity of dogma is a product of subtle minds; the Christianity of discipleship is reserved for chastened and loyal hearts. The path to Christian unity is not found by assenting to formulas, but by ascending to faith. The religion of Jesus is like a lofty hill about whose foot various travelers grope their way through entangling underbrush, and one group cries to another, "Here is the way!" and another answers, "No; it is here!" Then, as from the sky, comes the call, "Friend, come up higher!" And as the separated groups get higher up, the entanglements grow less and the horizon broad, and when they reach the top all the paths meet, and the different views become one view, and that view is a view all around.

[From Rev. Francis G. Peabody, D.D., in a sermon at King's Chapel, Boston, Mass.]

As a Modernist Sees It

THE Rev. H. D. A. Major, D.D., principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford, said that for the Modernist a unified Christendom enslaved intellectually and spiritually by the papal system would be a disaster. To have the Christian church governed absolutely by a single hierarchy, and the head of that hierarchy the most influential potentate in the world, would be as fatal to democratic ideals as it would be to Christian ideals. If achieved, such reunion would be followed by a condition of stagnation which would steadily invade every department of life, and that stagnation would as certainly at a later period be followed by violent reformation and anarchy. Toward papal reunion the

Modernist had no contribution to make. On the contrary, Modernism was a more formidable opponent to such reunion than was either Protestantism or Secularism, because Modernism had a more attractive alternative to offer mankind than had Romanism, Secularism, or traditional Protestantism.

The Modernist saw clearly the terrible danger which accompanied a reunion which was the outcome of skilful ecclesiastical compromise rather than the affirmation of Christian principles. Better far to have no reunion than a reunion of that kind. The words of the creeds, though they had the authority of ancient usage, and even of general councils, behind them, had not the authority of the words of Christ Himself and they believed that the verbal expression of the Christian faith in which the church of the future was to reunite must be found in some authentic affirmations of the Lord Himself. Nothing, in his view, was absolutely essential for the church but the spirit of Christ, through which was given the faith of Christ. This did not mean that they would dispense with all Christian institutions and rites—far from it—but that they would regard them as of less value than the Spirit who created them, and they would judge of their present value by moral and spiritual tests. The reunited church of the future must be wide enough to include the Quaker, and also wide enough to include the Romanist, if they so willed.

Answering the question what ought they, as Anglican Modernists, to do in the matter of practical reunion, the speaker said that, if they waited until all English churchmen were agreed upon a practical policy they would wait until doomsday. He urged that they ought to admit to holy communion all communicants from other Christian bodies who desired to communicate at their altars, and that Anglicans ought not to hesitate to communicate at those of other Christian bodies if they were willing to permit them to do so. They ought also to do all in their power to advance modern Christian education, both among the clergy and laity, and, if possible, also interdenominationally. They ought always, and even at considerable cost to themselves, to adopt and support a church policy which put first things first, and to coöperate heartily with those of other Christian communions in philanthropic and humanitarian endeavor. As regarded the stages of reunion, the Modernist would advocate that they began with intercommunion, and proceeded through denominational coöperation to federation. Organic unity was necessarily the last stage, and would seem to demand submission and absorption on the part of the smaller denominations.

[From *The Times*, London.]

As an Anglo-Catholic Sees It

THAT the Lausanne Conference scored a very notable immediate success is too apparent to be denied by those who have correct knowledge of what it did and of what it avoided doing. But this means only that it succeeded in fulfilling its appointed business of promoting mutual understanding of the differences in faith and order which have to be faced in effective labor for unity. That is, it means success in initiating an educational method which must be continued for some time in order to bring forth visible fruit. Incidentally, it enlightened many as to the vital strength and representative significance of the Catholic movement in the Anglican communion. Our position was greatly in evidence at Lausanne, and was reënforced in surprising ways. As one of the English delegates said to me, "The conference has more than justified the Catholic position."

The main work of the conference was done in sectional sessions from which reporters were excluded; and the press, being dependent upon secondary sources of information, gives very inadequate and sometimes misleading accounts. An English church paper, in particular, disparages the conference, and discovers evidence of its failure in the differences which it revealed. It is sufficient to reply that, if the conference had not revealed these differences, and made their real nature clear to many who had underestimated them, it would have failed to fulfil its appointed business. The paper referred to seems to be wedded to the idea that the aim of the conference was to widen substantially the area of agreements and to clear the ground for definite steps toward reunion — a futile aim, of course, but happily not the real one.

And what is the situation in Christendom that for the first time was brought clearly before those earnest leaders who think that with sufficient zeal and skill the barriers to reunion, at least outside the Roman and Eastern Orthodox churches, can be broken down in our day and generation? Briefly, it is that, whatever may be possible as between Protestant denominations, it is as impossible for reunion to be had with the Anglican communion, except on the basis of the ancient Catholic system, as with Rome and the East. A return of Protestants to that system of faith and order is the major condition of their participation in the general reunion of Christendom; and general realization among Anglicans of the Catholic nature and practical requirements of their inherited system is indispensable to their attainment of corporate reunion with the rest of Catholic Christendom.

And this means, of course, that for us the recovery of those around us to historic Christianity, to the ancient Catholic faith and order, is paramount in promoting Christian unity. But until Anglican Catholics realize that this involves sympathetic contact with those whom they are set to recover, and get over the fear-complex which confines their sympathies to full believers, to those least in need of their sympathies, their success will be seriously limited. The fear that to confer with Protestants is dangerous registers imperfect confidence in one's own position rather than the kind of assured conviction which is required for propagating Catholic principles.

[From Rev. Francis J. Hall in *The American Church Monthly*, New York.]

Christian Reunion as One of the Monks of Unity Sees It

NOTHING excites more interest in the modern world of religious thought than the great problem of Christian reunion. Two causes have given rise to this movement: one is of natural kind, the other belongs to the domain of the supernatural; and the value of the efforts that are being made to realize reunion varies with each. Those who work for reunion because it is "the great modern enterprise," or who wish to consecrate some of their free time to enlarging their outlook on religious life, those finally who wish to oppose the invincible, united front of all Christian forces to the allied strength of the evergrowing power of evil — these do well indeed; but they will get their reward already in this world. . . . Others work for the great ideal of Christian reunion because they remember the words of our Lord who, the night before He gave Himself up into the hands of the Jews, invited His chosen disciples to gather for a repast of love. In this supreme hour of separation, in that last moment of brotherly union on earth Christ bequeathed to the apostles, and through them to the whole world to come, the great testament of unity. "Father," prayed He, "*ut sint unum*"—"that they may be one as Thou and I are one . . .," that they may love each other for ever and ever, and that there be but one Shepherd and one fold. And after that testament of love Christ died to seal it with His blood; and He rose on the third day and ascended to heaven to watch over the unity of His church — His "mystical body," that had remained on earth.

What happened? How did the disciples hold the promise given to the divine Master?

Of course, the church could not divide itself, being a divine institution, but the "faithful" quarreled about her. The history of the church is a long series of successive divisions and again attempts at reunion: some of them successful, but most of them ephemeral.

What is it that has so often hindered Christian reunion, that has even in some cases prevented ecclesiastical unity once negotiated and signed from having any lasting effect?

I think the reply to this question is the very key to the whole problem of reunion: the religious psychology of the Eastern and Western churches has developed on different lines and sufficient care has not been taken to foster understanding and mutual charity between them. So it was that little by little they drifted apart and in some cases sealed their antagonism by an official excommunication.

Now it is an historical fact that no such excommunication has taken place between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Patriarchate of Moscow. After 1054 the papal legates returned to Rome via Kiev, where they visited the Russian prince, and for a long period the relationship between Rome and Russia remained perfectly friendly. It was only when the Mohammedan Tartars invaded the land that, in default of help from Europe against this "common foe," little by little the relationship ceased.

Cut off from each other for centuries and become strange and foreign to each other, Rome and Moscow, like all other Christian communities, have felt in this new age the stirrings of the holy Spirit. The divine call to reunion has been echoing through the world a thousand years, and it would seem to-day that humanity is preparing its heart to reply a great "Amen."

Wherever it may be — in the Anglo-Catholic England or in Stockholm 1925, Berne 1926, and Lausanne 1927, in India, Africa, or the United States — everywhere Christians long for more charity, for better understanding, for brotherly intercourse between separated brethren.

The holy see of St. Peter in Rome, instituted by divine providence as the center of visible unity in the church, has not ceased to appeal and work for reunion. His holiness, Pope Pius XI, has set out to realize a plan long and deeply meditated; he wants to be the "pope of reunion." On the 21st of March, 1924, a letter was sent to the abbot primate of the Benedictine Monks inviting him to found a special monastic confederation whose aim it would be to work for "better understanding and greater charity" between the East and West, these

being an indispensable preliminary, if ever, in future times, reunion is to be attained. And so a monastery is now being organized, in which every effort is made to study and appreciate what is of value in the great Eastern church; to bring forward to public notice the many common points in liturgy, ascetic doctrine, and ecclesiology; to develop and propagate every theological opinion or view that leads the way to sympathy, and to explain the very legitimate differences in our common official teaching. Most of these famous differences exist, indeed, only in terminology; or they come from the fact that one body was forced by historical circumstances to develop and define what the other kept in its original and less determined form. No essential difference could possibly get into the teaching, seeing that the church is undivisible and undivided and that nothing new could be added to the principal creeds common to both. That this adding has never been really done explains the absence of formal condemnation on either side.

Reunion, under such circumstances, should not be so unsurmountably difficult. The chief necessity is that there should be no question of one body *absorbing, changing, or annihilating* the other — liturgically, juridically, or even psychologically. It is therefore only a problem of drawing nearer to each other, studying the essence of things — a question of mutual love. If one does not “like” others it is often because one sees nothing but their faults; for some reason or other one wants them “to be like one’s self” because one is not tolerant, not large-minded enough. Now I think it is granted that no one is without faults, and that it is a very sorry occupation to pass one’s time in pointing them out to one’s brother instead of covering them with the mantle of discreet charity. Men’s faults are what is ugliest in them; one should not like to stare at them. A being in metaphysics is defined by what it is—positively—not by what it is not; in the same way, a soul is defined by the qualities in which it affirms itself, not by the vices in which it negates itself. . . .

We should want Christian reunion and strive for it not only because we need it for producing tangible results on earth, but also and above all because such is God’s holy will, and because, being members of Christ’s mystical body, we should commune in the desires of our Head, Jesus Christ. We should rejoice in our brothers’ joys and weep with them when they weep. If we want reunion we should first of all pray for it with all might and fervor; and then also work for it by becoming *worthy* of such a great grace of God!

The "Monks of Unity" at Amay-sur-Meuse in Belgium are an institution founded for that very purpose: "*pour s'étudier, se comprendre, s'aimer et s'unira* — to study, understand, love and unite. Under the leadership of the Rev. Dom Lambert Beaudin, O.S.B., they wish to create an atmosphere of sympathy and simple-hearted friendliness, without any proselytism or controversy.

When we have discovered each other's soul, when we have prepared our hearts for reunion, then God's hour will come. Surely He is only waiting for that to reveal to us the great miracle of Christian unity.

[From Dom Andre de Lilienfeld, O.S.B., Editor of *Irenikon*, the organ of the Benedictine Monks of Unity, in *The Orthodox Catholic Review*, Brooklyn.]

As an Indian Y. M. C. A. Worker Sees It

THE Lausanne Conference left many wondering whether it was going to achieve anything definite when the delegates went back to their respective communions and countries, and fell back into the old rut, and once again followed their hoary traditions. It is satisfactory, however, to know that the Indian delegation are not going to let the grass grow under their feet. They have been rousing Christian opinion in India to continue the discussions on the message, nature, and ministry of the church. Recently a number of missionaries and Indian leaders met to study the Lausanne reports in relation to India. The bishop of Bombay, who was outstanding in his remarks and attitude at Lausanne, still retains his convictions. He has declared his views at the Indian conference — first by maintaining "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is the church," and then proceeded to assert his viewpoint that what the churches in India need is negotiation for real corporate union, and that "We must have one organization, as complex as you like, but one." Rev. F. J. Edwards, of Bombay, on the other hand, speaking for the Free churches, would have a unity of spirit rather than an outward or corporate union. He pleaded for an interchange of pulpits and intercommunion to be adopted at once.

The Indian Christian leaders, on their side, are anxious that we should get away from the absurd position of professing to love God, whom we have not seen, and yet not being able to love a fellow-Christian of another denomination in corporate worship and communion, whose life, work, devotion to duty, and

singleness of purpose in the service of the Lord we have seen. Many are beginning to feel that, in the face of these weakening divisions with which the Indian Church is faced, whether the solution would not lie in both Anglicans and Presbyterians and Methodists becoming Quakers. It is a tragedy indeed to realize that the holy communion, which was meant to be the great bond of unity amongst the followers of the Nazarene, should be the one hindrance to the attainment of the great purpose for which He prayed that "they all may be one." Meanwhile, we all shall have to pray with all our might that the ideal of unity may become a reality."

[From Shoran S. Singha in *The Christian World*, London.]

Bishop Temple Makes Bold Proposals

DURING the discussion of the Congregational-Episcopal concordat plan at the General Convention in Portland, Bishop Brent said that the time had come for the Episcopal Church, which has taken the lead in discussing church unity, to take some practical step in that direction and "either to put up or shut up." We have been anxiously waiting for this challenge to be frankly and courageously met. The bishop of Manchester has now met it head-on with a recent pre-Lambeth Conference statement which constitutes a challenge to a bold and brave adventure of the spirit. How it will be met by the Church of England will be watched with the keenest interest in America. When will the church in America make a similar adventure into the realm of experimental religion?

We reprint the following account of Bishop Temple's statement, taken from *The Witness*:

"The bishop of Manchester has made two bold proposals which are likely to be discussed throughout Christendom for some time. Addressing his diocesan conference, he said that because the Church of England claimed to represent the true order of the church in this country they should be ready to welcome to their communion as a normal practice communicants in any recognized body. He went further by insisting that they must come to the conclusion that not only a Free church minister, but any layman who should devoutly and not defiantly decide that it was right for him devoutly to celebrate the holy communion, would effect a real consecration and through it the real gift would be given, and that Anglicans who were unable to receive holy communion in their own order should receive

it in this way. Bishop Temple takes his stand, first, on the canonical rule that any baptized Christian presenting himself in good faith is entitled to receive the communion, unless he is personally excommunicated; and, secondly, on the declaration at the Lambeth Conference that the great non-Episcopal bodies are to be recognized as in a real sense parts of the universal church. 'If that is so, it seems to me that one way of acting on this recognition is to accept their own disciplinary arrangements, and formally to welcome those who are by them actually admitted to communion.' Bishop Temple puts forward these suggestions now partly because as one of the delegates to the Lausanne Conference he feels responsible for thinking out what is the next step the Anglican church might take, and, further, because if the Lambeth Conference of 1920 is to take any decisive step a great deal of discussion should take place before it meets. *The Church Times* is, of course, wholly opposed to these 'grave departures from catholic principles and precedents.' *The Church of England Newspaper* and the *Record* support the bishop, the former remarking that if Dr. Temple can persuade his Episcopal brethren to follow his lead the solution of reunion will very soon be solved. Welcoming the proposals as 'a breath of healing' in the stress of controversy, and as opening up a broad pathway of unity of spirit, the *Christian World* remarks: 'We see but little hope for many a day of corporate reunion; but a true Christian unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace is what we do long for. And until Christian men, of all persuasions of church order, can meet together at the Lord's table as brothers in the household of faith, even the Christian unity for which all right-minded men earnestly pray can hardly be more than superficial.' "

[From *The Pacific Churchman*, San Francisco, Calif.]

Church Union in Scotland

TWENTY years of effort for the reunion of the Church of Scotland and the United Free church will soon culminate in the merging of these two Presbyterian bodies which together command the allegiance of the great majority of the people of Scotland, if the reasonable hopes of both parties are fulfilled. Ever since the Reformation, the Scottish people have adhered to the Presbyterian form of doctrine and organization with extraordinary fidelity, but various issues have arisen from time

to time to cause divisions. A diagram of the ramifying subdivisions and reunions since the Secession of 1733 looks like a map of a river threaded into diverging and converging streams as it meanders through a broad valley. The division that is of present significance arose with the Disruption of 1843, the chief cause of which was removed with the abolition of lay patronage in 1874. The issue between an established and a non-established church was reduced to the vanishing point by the acts of parliament of 1921 and 1925. It is no longer a part of the doctrine of the Church of Scotland that the church should be dependent upon state support or subject to state control. An act of the United Free church assembly at its recent session, to be submitted to the presbyteries for their approval, removes virtually the last barrier to union. While the full celebration of this event may properly wait until all the formalities have been complied with and the union has been actually accomplished, preliminary congratulations are appropriate at this time. If the Presbyterians of Scotland have in times past set a bad example in the matter of division, they have set a remarkably good one in their willingness to reconsider the grounds of the separation and repair the breaches. To effect a reunion only half a century after the practical disappearance of the cause of a split, is an extraordinary achievement. There are many divisions among the churches the grounds of which have been extinct much longer.

[From *The Christian Century*, Chicago.]

Union Church at Iowa State Teachers College

FEELING for some years the need of a more adequate religious program at the Iowa State Teachers College at Cedar Falls, local and national religious and educational authorities have been coöperating in an effort to find a solution. There has always been an exceptionally cordial religious atmosphere in this state institution. It has been broad, tolerant and yet vital. For example, the Bible has been taught for years and hundreds of students avail themselves of this privilege annually. Vesper services have been held on the campus with unusual success. But all this has been felt to be inadequate.

The city churches are down town and a bit too far away to be of the greatest service to the college. Furthermore, need has been felt for a home church atmosphere on the hill and to

attempt to build denominational churches would, it is thought by many, inaugurate a suicidal program for all. So a series of negotiations of local and national denominational representatives has issued in the organization of an interdenominational church, officially known as "College Hill Community Church of Cedar Falls." The charter members of this new enterprise represent ten denominations. They include 132 College Hill residents and 347 students of the college. They have pledged a generous sum to promote the enterprise, payments to start when the church begins to function. The Reverend Howland Hanson of Des Moines became the first pastor on September 14, 1927.

There is a college council on religious life composed of all the Protestant interests in the community. It will function through the community church and will therefore be somewhat of a church centered program in coöperation with the college. An interdenominational Sunday-school of religious education is being conducted, officered and taught by members of the college faculty.

Very naturally this church will need adequate quarters in which to conduct its program, so plans are being studied for the development of a building campaign. The People's Church at Michigan State College is being carefully studied for the lessons it has to teach in the creation of a similar program and the erection of a suitable structure.

Everyone interested in the advancement of harmony among Protestants will rejoice at the spirit and earnest efforts put forth at this important educational center to work together for a common end — college and community betterment.

[From O. D. Foster in *Christian Education*, New York.]

Conference at Mena, Egypt

A GREAT conference of 500 delegates from 95 churches met at Lausanne, representing Christians in practically every country. The problem before them was: How can we agree on matters of faith, and how can we bring order out of the present chaos in Christianity? This is surely striking at the very root of the matter, far more deeply than was attempted a year or two ago at Stockholm, when the question was: How can we make our manner of life and our work more in consonance with the will of God?

For us living in Egypt there is established ready to hand an instrument to deal with Christian unity, which is the Fellow-

ship of Unity. They went to Lausanne and they brought us here in Egypt what we needed, a spiritual stimulant, a vision, and an ideal to reach after. Let us see what took place at Mena House.

The hotel at the foot of the Giza Pyramids provided all we could wish for by way of bodily comfort. As was remarked more than once during the conference that great monument of Cheops towering above us spoke of power, unity, durability. "The whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth."

Very humble, beside this mighty pyramid, hidden away behind the hotel, was a tiny room, unknown to many who pass by; but that little room became the power house, where spiritual force was generated. Our first act was to meet in this house of God. We felt that we had a great deal to be thankful for, and a great deal to pray about, and a great many to pray for, and we wanted to put ourselves from the very beginning in God's hands. Each day of the conference, we met in the chapel and so set the perspective right. On the first day, his grace, Archbishop Thorgom of the Armenian Patriarchate spoke to us. We were (in God's presence) children of one God and Father, each talking to Him in our own language, confusing to us but understood by Him, divided among ourselves by long separation and misunderstanding and yet essentially one in Him. On the second day, we prayed in silence, lest the discordant note of unknown tongues should interrupt our approach to God: while on the third day a service of penitence was held. What could have been more appropriate? Owing to organic divisions we could not all partake of the sacrament of unity, which many of us felt to be the ideal service on such occasion, but also, that was impossible. The *raison d'être* of our meeting was to make it possible somehow in God's good time. The address at this service of penitence was given by a priest of the Coptic Church, Rev. Ibrahim Luka, who reminded us that we could at least together join in fighting against the common enemy, and do something to purify society of much corruption.

During the mornings the conference listened to addresses from men of very different points of view. For instance, the Archbishop of Nubia told us of his impressions of the World Conference at Lausanne, and frankly explained the reasons why the Greek Orthodox Church was unable to subscribe to several of the resolutions put forward.

The Rev. M. Richmond gave a lucid account of the remarkable harmony which pervaded the World Conference. It was a miracle that the conference could take place at all, and he concluded by deprecating delay in bringing unity to the religious and social life of the East; the Rev. Ibrahim Said, of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, made a great impression by his eloquent appeal (in two languages): he was speaking on Egypt's response to the call of Lausanne and said: "There will never be any real unity until there is a frank confession on both sides that without each other we can no longer live in a state of honor." And he pleaded that an all-pervading spirit of charity might fill the Christian world. "When the waters of the Nile subside, you find a streamlet here, a rivulet there, or again a brook over there — all divided by banks of mud or sand. But when the time of inundation comes, the banks of the river overflow and all such partitions disappear."

On the evening of the second day of the conference, one of the most interesting events took place: the members separated themselves into three groups, to study set questions arising out of the subject in hand. Group I, led by Dr. H. E. Phillips, tried to find out what kind of unity was enjoyed by the early church, why it became broken, and finally ought we to be content with the existence of friendly relations between the churches, that is, federation. Group II, led by Rev. M. Richmond, had a most interesting discussion on the nature of the church, which revealed considerable difference of opinion, but the participants in the debate preserved throughout an entirely friendly attitude toward those who differed, and views were exchanged with complete frankness and conviction.

Group III, led by Mitry Eff. Dewairy, proved the most fertile of all in practical suggestions, as indeed might be expected by the terms of reference laid before it. In answer to the question: How can we give practical expression to our unity in Egypt, the reply came: 1 — By the formation of a headquarters with a paid secretary to organize other fellowship in the provinces, to arrange for public meetings, and for publicity work. 2 — By united effort against social evils. 3 — By closer coöperation between the clergy and laity of all denominations.

Here is surely abundant food for thought, which must shortly be translated into action; the danger is that we shall delay long enough to forget all about it, under the stress of a multiplicity of claims demanding our time and attention. Our feelings at the conclusion of the conference were that some-

where along the lines which we were pursuing lay the truth. We ought not to rest till we had grasped it.

There are many other memories of our Mena House Conference which will long remain in our minds. No mention has been made already to the social side, the incidental conversations, the exchange of opinions between men of vastly different character and outlook. The fact that members and officials of the Coptic, Greek Orthodox, Syrian, Armenian, Anglican, Presbyterian, Wesleyan churches met together and partook of meals without the least "cramping of style," marks a certain degree of advance. Indeed, it was a memorable occasion when some 50 of us sat down to a social dinner and enjoyed the mutual society of our fellow members, and listened to speeches from Saleeb Pasha Claudius, Bishop Gwynne, and our excellent president, Mr. H. de Bildt, to whom we all owe so much for the furtherance of our movement. Again, a new and most hopeful development of the Men's Fellowship is the formation of a Women's Fellowship which bids fair to eclipse the older edition. Ladies were present at all the Mena House meetings in considerable numbers, and were evidently alive to the points at issue. On the last day we dispersed with high resolve to assert ourselves more, as men and women who had a message, who had seen a vision of better things to come, and who must not rest till we had impressed others with the truth which was gradually being revealed to our own generation.

[From *The Egyptian Gazette*, Alexandria, Egypt.]

BOOK REVIEWS

THE HEIGHTS OF CHRISTIAN UNITY. A Plea for One Holy Catholic Church. By Doremus A. Hayes, Chair of New Testament Interpretation Graduate School of Theology, Evanston, Ill. New York and Cincinnati: The Abingdon Press; 271 pages; price, \$1.75.

This book begins with a beautiful parable of a thousand pilgrims climbing Fujiyama by many different paths on the same day. Passing upward through rain, clouds, and dense fog, they all reached the top together where there was sunshine. Dr. Hayes discusses under four parts the problems of Christian unity with a clarity and vigor that gives heart to all who are interested in the fulfilment of the dream of our Lord for the oneness of His disciples. With the recent action of the Methodist Episcopal Conference in its appointment of a special commission to approach Presbyterians and others relative to unity, any book from a Methodist on this subject arrests attention, for with the characteristic vigor of that communion we would rejoice in its leadership in the cause of Protestant unity. No communion is better equipped for such leadership.

But with nearly a dozen books bearing his name on their title pages Dr. Hayes makes a distinct contribution. He emphasizes Paul's prayer and Paul's platform, from which conclusions he recognizes the dissent of the Catholic and High Church positions and maintains that Protestants, in separating from the pope, were not separated from Christ nor the church of Christ. He shows how our divisions have set up a guerilla warfare, making our divisions a sin against the very ideal of the Christian life. He says, "It is a question whether our continued schisms are not our crowning crime." He shows the scandal in missionary effort by a divided church, but finds hope in the turning of the tide making toward reunion, citing many adventures among the denominations.

He discusses hindrances in church organization, forms of worship, and creeds, but rightly sees help in the growth of humility and tolerance and forbearance and appreciation and leadership of the Spirit. These are mighty factors making for progress toward the consummation of the ideal, which Dr. Hayes argues, is to be on the foundation of Christ, "one in Christ, one in holiness, a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, holy and without blemish in the sight of the Lord." The spirit of the book is fine and the presentation is clear and comprehensive, revealing a passion for the unity of the church that is strong and sensible.

THE CONVERSATIONS AT MALINES 1921-1925. New York and London: Oxford University Press; 95 pages; price, \$1.50.

One of the sad tragedies of Christianity is that there are groups of Christians that are unwilling to sit with other groups of Christians to talk over their differences in the hope of understanding. This is almost an unthinkable condition. It raises the question as to whether Christianity is an empty name without any regard to Christ. In 1921 Lord Halifax of the Anglican Church visited Cardinal Mercier at Malines in the interest of a *rapprochement* of the Anglican Church to the Roman Church. The cardinal gladly assented to the request. The Anglicans had sent out an appeal to all Christian people the year before, so the time was opportune to approach the Roman Church on one side as approaches had been made to Protestants on the other side, only the approaches to Protestants had been made publicly, while the Malines conversations were held secretly.

This little volume is an account of these conversations, one page being in English and the other in French. There were three outstanding churchmen from each side that composed the conference. The conversations touched upon questions of doctrine and discipline with no new interpretations other than those that are generally recognized as separating the Anglican Church from the Roman Church, but in spirit and in freedom of discussion there were marked advances over previous attempts of this character. Both groups were Christians and they sought earnestly to find an understanding.

It must always be regretted that these conversations ever came under criticism by the respective churches. There were elements both in the Anglican Church and in the Roman Church that assumed ugly attitudes when these conversations were made public. A writer elsewhere in this number of *The Christian Union Quarterly* dissents from the value of these conversations, but it is the common denominational attitude which is so prevalent among the churches when efforts are made toward reconciliation. But the fact is that the conversations were held. There will come another opportunity when other conversations will be held, for there are fine types of Christians among Anglicans and Romans who eagerly long for reconciliation in the whole church.

PEACE OR WAR? By J. M. Kenworthy, M.P. With a Foreword by H. G. Wells. New York: Boni & Liveright; 338 pages; price, \$2.50.

The text of this provocative volume is Exodus 32:17 — "There is a noise of war in the camp." This volume may be regarded as one of the voices that made possible the signing of the multilateral treaty in Paris on August 27, 1928. Lt. Commander Kenworthy makes a strong argument for a more reasonable adjustment of our international disputes than by a senseless system of wholesale murder, which is another name for war. It is an encyclopedic presentation of the war-making factors of the world. As a

well-known member of the British Parliament and a distinguished naval officer, he is not afraid to say that if the present condition of things continues another world war will break out in the next twenty years, starting with England and America and Japan, and involving the rest of the world. The seeds have been sown, he says, and they are germinating. The result will be the destruction of our present day civilization and culture, with the establishment "of general Bolshevism, complete anarchy, and the disappearance of credit." The picture is not too severely drawn. If the nations will take whole-heartedly the signing of the peace pact, beginning by reducing armaments, and preparing for peace, there is a possibility of averting this world disaster. Every Christian ought to be unafraid to say, "I will not take up arms under any circumstances to kill my brethren," and say it so loud that the governments of the world will hear it. But perhaps this is too much to ask of a church that has not learned how to proclaim peace in its own fold. Lt. Commander Kenworthy has given to the world a great book.

THE ETERNAL SPIRIT IN THE DAILY ROUND. Meditations for the Modern Mind. By Frank Carleton Doan, Ph.D., Author of *Religion and the Modern Mind*. With an Introduction by Samuel McChord Crothers and a Preface by Harold E. B. Speight. New York and London: Harper & Brothers; 204 pages.

In these busy times an increasing number of people are coming to recognize the importance of meditation. Augustine's *Confessions*, Episcetetus's *Discourses*, Amiel's *Journal*, and Marcus Aurelius's *Thoughts* are being reread with increasing interest. They belong with the Psalms, à Kempis's *Imitation of Christ*, and similar books that have come out of solitude. Dr. Doan's *Eternal Spirit in the Daily Rounds* belongs in this collection. It was published after his death. Dr. Crothers, who wrote the introduction, likewise passed away before this book was published. But Dr. Speight's preface serves well to introduce this rare volume to those who are finding help in retiring for meditation. It is divided into six parts: (1) the daily round, (2) the ways of the eternal, (3) tides of the Spirit, (4) the ascending years, (5) why wander so far and wide, O my soul? and (6) the eternal likeness. It is a book of enchanting beauty for the poetic minded. Every chapter is a poem. All lovers of meditation will revel in it to great profit.

WHAT IS HERESY? A Comparative Analysis of the Teaching of Protestant and Catholic Bibles on Heretics. By G. M. Vizenzinovich. Baltimore: John Murphy Company. 128 pages; price, \$1.50.

This book makes a collection of all the passages of Scripture against heretics, who, it claims, are all those Christians who do not accept the

Roman Catholic Church as the true and only church. It defines heresy as "error repugnant to the faith, pertinaciously held by one who professes the Christian religion," which, it claims, are all those Christians who are outside of the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore they should be "avoided," "reproved," "punished," "admonished," "books burnt," and being "fore-runners of the anti-christ" and "likened unto the devil," they are "ravenous wolves," "unchaste," "ignorant," "proud," "obstinate," and "cannot enter the kingdom of heaven." All these terms, of course, apply to Protestants, Anglicans, whose priesthood is called the "clergy of heretics," and Eastern Orthodox, whose priesthood is likewise so classed. But the Roman Catholics are the pure and the holy! The archbishop of Baltimore puts his imprimatur on the book! This is the year 1928!

Mrs. Vizenzinovich was baptized twice as a Protestant and doubtless again as a Roman Catholic. We have a similar book on our desk written by an ex-priest of the Roman Catholic Church and he makes the same points against the Roman Catholic Church that Mrs. Vizenzinovich makes against all those outside the Roman Catholic Church, but we do not propose to review it in this number of *The Christian Union Quarterly*. One book of this type is enough for the present. Christian unity will never come by this method. Christians of all churches have got to learn the way of Christ and there is not a sentence in this book that indicates that the author has that spirit. His humility, His love, and His Spirit are to be released from their obscurity until Christians shall discover their brotherhood rather than their animosities. Roman Catholics will never win Protestants by attempting to prove that Protestants have departed from the true faith, nor will Protestants ever win Roman Catholics by attempting to prove that the Roman Catholic Church is the harlot of the Apocalypse; neither is true. Both Catholics and Protestants are unworthy Christians who have lost the badge of Christian integrity, which is love. When we discover this we will change our attitudes.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION. By Andrew Judson Murphy, member of the St. Louis Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. For sale by the author, 3137 Summit Street, Kansas City, Mo.; 101 pages; price, \$1.00.

The purpose of the fourteen chapters in this interesting little book is to combat extremists, both on water baptism and on the second blessing. The author's sources are largely from the Scriptures and he maintains that baptism of the Holy Spirit is regeneration. There is an earnestness throughout the book,—a clear, concise presentation and a desire to disentangle confused thinking.

PSYCHOLOGICAL CARE OF INFANT AND CHILD. By John B. Watson, Ph.D., Formerly Professor of Psychology, Johns Hopkins University, Author of *Behaviorism*. With the assistance of Rosalie Rayner Watson. New York: W. W. Norton & Company; 195 pages; price, \$2.00.

Physiological care of infants is uppermost in the minds of parents. Dr. Watson has written a practical and informing volume on the psychological care of infants and children, which is certainly as necessary as the physiological care, and in some ways is more important. He dedicates this volume "to the first mother who brings up a happy child." He discusses how the behaviorist studies infants and children, fears of children and how to control them, danger of too much mother love, control of rage and temper tantrums, night and daytime care, what to tell children about sex, and the behaviorist's apologia. It is written in a simple, easy reading style and parents will find in it much valuable help.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF NUTRITION. By Mary Swartz Rose, Ph.D., Professor of Nutrition, Teachers College, Columbia University. New York: The Macmillan Company; 501 pages.

Few people know how to eat. Many have been taught good manners at the table, but, as a rule, the same people are ignorant as to the significance of food in daily life. This book is written for those who wish to live more intelligently. The illustrations, animal experimentations, and the general information make this a book of first importance in every family. Dr. Rose discusses the science of nutrition, the body's need of energy and the source of supply, energy required of adults, energy required of children, food as regulating material, the discovery of vitamins and their functions, and the construction of an adequate diet. No one can read this book with its well established conclusions without being impressed with the need of its standards being set up in homes of the nation.

THE RELIGION OF TIBET, by J. E. Ellan (Dutton) is a valuable book in the study of Lamaism. INFLUENCE OF WEEKLY REST-DAY IN HUMAN WELFARE (New York Sabbath Committee) is a contribution in scientific research on the value of periodic rests for human welfare. HOW TO SLEEP ON A WINDY NIGHT, by Joseph Bentley (Henry Artemus Co.) is full of illustrations which teach that, if one has done his duty, he can sleep on a windy night; however stormy outside, he will have peace in his conscience. THE MINISTER'S WIFE, by Gustine Courson Weaver (Powell & White, Cincinnati) is a beautiful little book of poetry, pictures, and prayers by a minister's wife.

Christian Unity Conference
of the
CHRISTIAN UNITY LEAGUE
at
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

Place: Linwood Christian Church

Time: January 16, 17, 1929

Address each morning, Group Conferences and General Conference each afternoon. Addresses in the evening, closing on the last evening with the celebration of the Lord's Supper, with Dr. B. A. Jenkins presiding and ministers of all Christian communions assisting.

No official delegates, but volunteers from all communions. Every group of Christians within a thousand miles of Kansas City ought to be represented in this Conference. The Program will be announced soon.

For particulars write Peter Ainslie, Ten Hills, Baltimore, Md.



The "Supreme Authority"

**WEBSTER'S
NEW INTERNATIONAL
DICTIONARY**

—THE MERRIAM-WEBSTER

Because

Hundreds of Supreme Court Judges concur in highest praise of the work as their *Authority*.

The Presidents of all leading Universities, Colleges, and Normal Schools give their hearty *indorsement*.

All States that have adopted a large dictionary as *standard* have selected Webster's New International.

The Schoolbooks of the Country *adhere* to the Merriam-Webster system of diacritical marks.

The Government Printing Office at Washington uses it as *authority*.

G. & C. MERRIAM COMPANY
SPRINGFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS

Get The Best!

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS

At the Editor's Desk	
Christian Unity Conferences — The Federal Council — The Call of the Episcopal Bishops — Dr. Rogers and Intercommunion	
Can the Religions of the World Be Mobilized for Peace?	FREDERICK LYNCH
Christian Unity and the General Convention	BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, JR.
Methodist Proposals for Union	WILLIAM F. McDOWELL
The Contribution of the Rochester Meeting of the Federal Council to Christian Unity	JOHN MILTON MOORE
Protestant High Churchmanship	ROBERT A. ASHWORTH
The Rationale of the Community Church	OSCAR JACOBY RANDALL
Christian Value-Judgment in Relation to Christian Union	W. J. LHAMON
A Protest Against Intercommunion	B. TALBOT ROGERS
A Restudy of Church Union	WILLIAM M. BELL
Problems of Our Coöperative Work	MADISON A. HART
What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity	
The Pastoral Letter of the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church — The Immediate Obligation Toward Christian Unity — Protestant Church Women Looking Toward Unity — New England Conference on Christian Unity — Baptists Welcome Round Table — Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit — Unity From Within — The Appeal Must Be to Christ	
Book Reviews	
Affirmative Religion — Christianity, Past and Present — Whither Mankind — New Horizons of the Christian Faith, etc.	

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Inc.
W. H. HOOVER, President
230 N. FULTON AVE., BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.
AGENTS:
Fleming H. Revell Company, New York
Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai

A Statement

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the Unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are free to all indications of Christian Unity and Ventures of Faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all others who accept Jesus as Lord and Savior—are parts of the Church of Christ and that their Equality before God is the paramount issue of modern times.

Such a journal must, necessarily, be unofficial in its attempt to be an Interpreter of the mind of the churches and in furnishing a Forum for better understanding and cordial appreciation between the divided, and sometimes far isolated, communions of Christendom. It, thereby, seeks to contribute something to clear the way to the Altar of Reconciliation.

It does not hold itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors, except in a very general way as to their character and general attitude; but it invites to its pages such contributions of thought as will, on one hand, help in the removal of misunderstandings, and, on the other, create an atmosphere where our differences may be frankly faced and freely discussed in Christian Fellowship.

All contributors are allowed the same freedom in the expression of their thoughts, as the Editor exercises for himself. He does not anticipate that others will always approve his thoughts, any more than he presumes to assume responsibility for the thoughts of others; but every writer is responsible for what appears above his own name. We are to be free to think and equally free to let think, until, in corporate thinking and corporate praying, we find the Road to Brotherhood.

Consequently, this journal is not only not the organ of any party in Christendom; but, likewise, it is not the exponent of any theory of Christian Unity. It follows the reality in personal experience of spiritual growth in Christ—growing up in Him and toward other Christians as we find the Truth, which shall free us from suspicion, prejudice, pride, and unlove. Then we shall be able to interpret Christ in those terms which He expressed in His own words,—“By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have Love one to another.”

CONTENTS

JANUARY, 1929

VOL. XVIII.

No. 3.

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK.....	179
CHRISTIAN UNITY CONFERENCES.....	179
THE FEDERAL COUNCIL.....	180
THE CALL OF THE EPISCOPAL BISHOPS.....	181
DR. ROGERS AND INTERCOMMUNION.....	183
CAN THE RELIGIONS OF THE WORLD BE MOBILIZED FOR PEACE?. FREDERICK LYNCH	187
CHRISTIAN UNITY AND THE GENERAL CONVENTION..... BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, JR.	194
METHODIST PROPOSALS FOR UNION..... WILLIAM F. McDOWELL	200
THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE ROCHESTER MEETING OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL TO CHRISTIAN UNITY..... JOHN MILTON MOORE	202
PROTESTANT HIGH CHURCH- MANSHIP..... ROBERT A. ASHWORTH	207
THE RATIONALE OF THE COM- MUNITY CHURCH..... OSCAR JACOBY RANDALL	212
CHRISTIAN VALUE-JUDGMENT IN RELATION TO CHRISTIAN UNION..... W. J. LHAMON	220
A PROTEST AGAINST INTER- COMMUNION..... B. TALBOT ROGERS	228
A RESTUDY OF CHURCH UNION.. WILLIAM M. BELL	231
PROBLEMS OF OUR COOPERATIVE WORK..... MADISON A. HART	236
WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY.....	246
BOOK REVIEWS.....	267

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

230 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

Entered as second-class matter October 18th, 1923, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.,
under the Act of Congress of March 3rd, 1879.

The Christian Union Quarterly

EDITOR

PETER AINSLIE, D.D., Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FREDERICK LYNCH, D.D., Educational Secretary Church Peace Union, New York, and BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, JR., D.D., Rector St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, Richmond, Va.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

DR. HAMILCAR ALIVISATOS,
Athens, Greece.

BISHOP CHARLES P. ANDERSON,
Chicago, Ill.

REV. NEHEMIAH BOYNTON, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.

BISHOP CHARLES H. BRENT,
Buffalo, N.Y.

DEAN CHARLES R. BROWN,
New Haven, Conn.

PROF. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN,
New York, N.Y.

REV. RAYMOND CALKINS, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass.

BISHOP JAMES CANNON, JR.,
Washington, D.C.

PROF. DR. J. EUGENE CHOISY,
Geneva, Switzerland.

REV. S. D. CHOWN, D.D.,
Toronto, Canada.

DR. J. A. CRAMER,
Utrecht, Holland.

PROF. DR. ADOLF DEISSMANN,
Berlin, Germany.

REV. A. W. FORTUNE, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky.

DEAN H. E. W. FOSBROKE,
New York, N.Y.

DEAN W. E. GARRISON,
Chicago, Ill.

PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE,
London, England.

MOST REV. METROPOLITAN GERMANOS,
Thyatira, Asia Minor.

PRESIDENT W. A. HARPER,
Elon College, N. C.

DR. HENRY T. HODGKIN,
Shanghai, China.

REV. FINIS S. IDLEMAN, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.

DEAN W. R. INGE,
London, England.

PROF. RUFUS M. JONES,
Haverford, Pa.

REV. SAMUEL McCOMB, D.D.,
Dresden, Germany.

BISHOP FRANCIS J. McCONNELL,
New York, N.Y.

BISHOP WILLIAM F. McDOWELL,
Washington, D.C.

REV. WILLIAM P. MERRILL, D.D.,
New York, N.Y.

DR. WILFRED MONOD,
Paris, France.

DR. C. C. MORRISON,
Chicago, Ill.

DR. JOHN R. MOTT,
New York, N.Y.

BISHOP HARALD OSTENFELD,
Copenhagen, Denmark.

BISHOP EDWARD L. PARSONS,
San Francisco, Calif.

PROF. ARTHUR S. PEAKE,
Manchester, England.

PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS,
Lancaster, Pa.

PRINCIPAL W. B. SELBIE,
Oxford, England.

PASTOR DR. FRIEDRICH SIEGMUND-
SCHULTZE,
Berlin, Germany.

DR. ROBERT E. SPEER,
New York, N.Y.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA,
Upsala, Sweden.

DR. HENRY VAN DYKE,
Princeton, N. J.

REV. JOSEPH A. VANCE, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich.

BISHOP BOYD VINCENT,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK,
York, England.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

JANUARY, 1929

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK

Christian Unity Conferences

ON another page of this magazine will be found an interesting account of the New England Christian Unity Conference, held in Boston in November. The fellowship of thinking together is illustrated in this conference. The findings are worthy of consideration. The observance of the Lord's supper was also in its program.

This month the Mid-West Christian Unity Conference will be held in Kansas City, January 16th and 17th. The place of meeting will be the Linwood Christian Church, of which Dr. Burris A. Jenkins is minister. The conference opens the first day with addresses by Dr. M. Ashby Jones, St. Louis; Dr. Cliff Titus, Joplin; Dr. Ross W. Sanderson, Wichita; and the editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*. The following day the speakers will be Dr. Ivan Lee Holt, St. Louis; Dr. Harry Clayton Rogers, Kansas City; Dr. Edwin D. Starbuck, Iowa City; Dr. Samuel Harkness, Kansas City; and Dr. D. J. Evans, Kansas City. On the first evening Dr. E. S. Ames, Chicago, will speak and on the second evening Dr. Robert Nelson Spencer, Kansas City, will speak. The conference will close with a celebration of the Lord's supper conducted by the minister of the Linwood Christian Church.

Both afternoons will be given to group conferences for the first half of the afternoon and the latter half of the afternoon will be given to general conference, out of which ought to come definite findings regarding the attitude of the middle west to the whole problem of Christian unity. The indications are that this conference will be worth while. No invitations will be issued, but doubtless all of the states in the middle west will be represented. All the conferences of the Christian Unity League are voluntary gatherings. Any Christian may register

as a member and take part in the discussions, irrespective of his denomination. The sentiment for a united Christendom is growing. Everywhere people are seeing the futility of a divided Christendom. Whoever helps a little becomes a helper for the healing of this scandal.

The Federal Council

THE quadrennial meeting of the Federal Council in Rochester last month marked twenty years of history in American church federation. It is hardly believable what has been accomplished in those years. In 1908 at the first meeting in Philadelphia the Protestant churches approached each other timidly. After twenty years of coöperation there is a cordial and permanent fellowship. The work of the Council is an outstanding service in American Christianity which is prophetic of greater accomplishments. Federation has proven to be the most hopeful road to Protestant unity in the United States.

Twenty years ago unity could not be mentioned in the meetings of the Federal Council. In the Rochester meeting it was on the lips of a dozen speakers every day. Federation has created an atmosphere to which many are responding. It was perhaps too previous to expect a move toward federal unity at Rochester. The suggestion could hardly have been taken seriously; but no harm was done by proposing the discussion, which, however, did not get very far. More coöperation and a little more time; larger understanding and more appreciation of each other — these are the factors that make for unity.

One of the most urgent needs of Protestant coöperation is on the mission fields. The time must come when, under a common missionary board, all this work in non-Christian lands must be done coöperatively. The value of unification at this point will be found not in the results on the mission fields alone but in the homeland as well. In order to find the attitude of the denominational boards, we approached them some time ago. They all answered with nice letters; but, with the exception of two or three, the denominational boards were firm in their

denominational loyalties. Perhaps caution has to be practiced in this instance because of the backward conscience of denominations. Never has there been in all denominations more urgency for coöperation and unity than now.

The Federal Council has opened wide the possibilities of unity. Their work is to be heartily commended. Many of the best men and women of the nation are enlisted in its cause. The choice of Bishop Francis J. McConnell of the Methodist Episcopal Church as president for the next four years was particularly happy. He is a leader with wide horizons. The Methodist Church is already foremost in the cause of unity. Dr. Cadman, the retiring president, rendered fine service and made possible a larger growth for the coming years. The prayers of the Protestant churches rise in thanksgiving for the Federal Council and its staff of workers.

The Call of the Episcopal Bishops

ANY church that has a national gathering these days and makes no call for unity is a church with a lost vision. A church that concerns itself solely with its petty denominational affairs is deadening to spiritual life. Every one interested in Christian unity must be interested in the definite approaches toward each other on the part of the Christians and Congregationalists. One of the leaders in the former denomination, Barton W. Stone, was one of the first voices in America for the union of the church of God. The Christians are following him and their other leaders in making practical these things for which those pioneers in unity stood.

John Wesley was an advocate of Christian unity. To the honor of his memory the Methodist Episcopal Church went on record last spring at their General Conference for definite approaches to Presbyterians and others. In the recent General Convention of the Protestant Episcopalians a pastoral letter on unity from their bishops was approved and will be read by the rector of every parish to his congregation. It is a noble

utterance, looking out beyond their denomination for unity with the whole church of Christ. The Episcopalians have shown an interest in this subject that gives to them a leadership which they handle well.

It is commendable that such a letter is sent out with the approval of the convention. Its influence in all the parishes of the Episcopal Church will be felt by the discussion which it necessarily will call forth. Some Episcopalians will think it has gone too far; other Episcopalians will think it has not gone far enough; but that which is most significant is that the call for unity has been made. There is nothing better than any denominational national gathering has put forth on this subject. It is clear, courageous, and hopeful.

All the denominations have serious internal problems. As there are denominations outside, there are sub-denominations inside. The sub-denominations among the Episcopalians are Catholics and Protestants. It has been to the credit of the Episcopalians to hold together these two forces until they learn that they are not so much antagonistic to each other as they are supplementary to each other. Consequently an official document from the Episcopal Church has to look both ways. It is not a bad idea. If the great body of Catholics and Protestants cannot get together Christianity is doomed. The Episcopalians are making an experiment that ought to be a real contribution in the reconciling of these two apparently opposing factors.

It is difficult for a denominational statement to be made by any denomination without betraying the characteristic weakness of denominationalism, which is denominational loyalty. As though the bishops were afraid that they had set up too many fine and courageous standards that might be taken as they appeared to have been intended, they plead for loyalty to the use of the Prayer Book language—very good language indeed, but a trifling thing when discussing the unity of the church of Christ! It recalls an instance in a Christian unity conference in the west some years ago, when a Baptist speak-

ing in the conference said, "Whatever coöperation or unity we may have, Baptist psychology must be preserved."

But taking it altogether the letter is a fine document. It is not afraid to say that division in the church is sin. "To the extent that division exists Christ is absent." "Saintship is the monopoly of no communion." "We must seek for unity where the response is likely." "We must dare to be misunderstood." "No work of the leaders can bring unity without the coöperation of the people." "Our Lord Jesus Christ summons us to unity. We must obey the summons." And many other fine sentences. The whole letter will be found on another page and deserves prayerful reading.

We are glad the Episcopalians are speaking so clearly and so comprehensively upon this subject. They have set an example for other denominations to do likewise in their national gatherings. Out of many utterances will come action. The action may differ sometimes from what has been spoken, but so both utterances and action move toward understanding and appreciation God is speaking. Every denomination is summoned to look toward a united Christendom.

Dr. Rogers and Intercommunion

OUR friend, the Rev. Dr. Rogers, has an article in this issue of *The Christian Union Quarterly* protesting against intercommunion. We are glad to give space to his article, particularly that we have known him for years and esteem him highly. He is our brother in the Lord.

More than three-fourths of Christendom may be classed as close communion churches. Because the editor of this journal belongs to an open communion denomination does not put him necessarily on the side of open communion. His denomination believes in closed membership, receiving into its membership only those persons who have been baptized by immersion, but he has broken with that custom of his denomination because it denies the equality of all Christians before God. With him it

is the same thing regarding close communion. The editor of this journal insists that the equality of all Christians before God is a more vital issue than the combined peculiarities of all the denominations.

We follow the trend of these times in favoring conferences and prayer and have given much time toward advancing these ideas. In fact we were advocating this method before the commission on the World Conference on Faith and Order was appointed. We have heartily supported the World Conference and all other conferences. In this method is hope for understanding in the divided church.

But if these conferences are to go further what would be more salutary than for all the members of the conference to meet in humility and penitence at the Lord's table? Is there no virtue in the Lord's supper? Why not appropriate its help toward giving us an understanding in brotherhood? It is brotherhood that we have lost. Let us see if we cannot find it in coming face to face with the suffering of Christ symbolized in the bread and wine.

When we Christians differed we ran away and built a wall to keep other Christians off. Are we not brave enough to suffer and think together? What could bring us to that more than meeting as equals before God at the Lord's table?

If there are any who do not want to come, there is not the slightest effort made to force them to come. There is no method by which anybody could be forced to come to a voluntary celebration of the Lord's supper. These Christian unity conferences where the Lord's supper has been observed are purely voluntary gatherings. Nobody is compelled to come to the meetings much less to the Lord's supper. At the same time we would be glad if the whole church would seek the way of the Cross as equals together before God at the Lord's supper.

There are multitudes in all these denominations, both among the ministers and the laity, who are restless amid these restrictions which seek to keep Christians apart. They love their denominations, but they are sympathetic toward a fellow-

ship that goes beyond their denominations. It is this element in all denominations that is making possible a united Christendom.

Denominational loyalty and Christian unity are two elements that cannot work together very well. If all the denominations are going to be forever loyal to their denominational customs, there can never be a united Christendom. The editor of this journal believes in supplanting denominational loyalty by loyalty to Christ. Then let us ask concerning the requirements of Christ rather than the requirements of any denominations. It is his church that is involved and all Christians are members of that household, but denominationalism has separated us. What would be more healing in our strife than setting up among ourselves the Lord's table with all of us partaking of the symbols of brotherhood as equals before God?

The dangerous attitude is not in asking all Christians to come to the Lord's Supper, but in prohibiting other Christians who are not of our denomination from coming. That is the scandalous thing. How a man can answer that before an intelligent world, not to speak of answering before God, is to involve himself most seriously. We have no desire to find fault with any denomination. These customs have grown up through the years and every denomination is challenged to adjust itself to these changes that make for the equality of all Christians before God.

Therefore the editor of this journal insists that if Christian unity is to come it is to come by the way of us all being truly equals before God at the Lord's supper. There has got to be a great change in Christendom if Christianity is to supplant denominationalism. We have no desire to offend the least in any denomination, nor are we seeking to please any. We are trying to find our way out of this entanglement and there are enough Christians now in all the denominations to join hands in brotherly fashion for a larger understanding of others and of Christ, who is the brother of us all.

Dr. Rogers is a Christian gentleman. He is more Christian than his system. The same thing is true of the editor's denomination. One of its finest Christian ministers declined to receive into his church a member of Dr. Rogers' denomination without rebaptism. He knew his position was ugly and untenable before an intelligent world, but he too was caught in the meshes of his denominational custom. Likewise he too was better than his denomination. Embarrassed by the situation, particularly because of the beautiful character of the member of Dr. Rogers' denomination, he wrote us, not asking what to do but to lament what he had to do. We wrote him, "It is an instance of the pathos and absurdity of denominationalism. You will, of course, do what you think you ought to do, but, for my part, I would not require rebaptism, and I would let the consequences take care of themselves. Denominationalism has got to be removed in order that Christians may be free to practice equality of all Christians before God. The only way that I see it can be done is by the multiplying of individual action on the part of as many Christians in the various denominations until their actions become strong enough to influence the whole denomination."

We do not detract in the least from a certain respect that is due all denominations. In the last issue of *The Christian Union Quarterly* a distinguished Catholic priest called Lord Halifax "a dangerous busybody" and regarded Cardinal Mercier as having "made a tactical blunder in entering into such discussions" as the Malines conversations afforded. Neither of these appeared to have been following the beaten path of his denomination; hence the adverse criticism. The hope for Christian unity lies in the increase of those who are not contented to walk always in the beaten paths of denominationalism. God has something better for his children than denominational conformity and his children are feeling it in their contacts one with another.

CAN THE RELIGIONS OF THE WORLD BE MOBILIZED FOR PEACE?

BY REV. FREDERICK LYNCH, D. D.

Educational Secretary of the Church Peace Union, New York, and Associate
Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*

ANYONE who has followed the movements inside the Christian Church during the last ten years could not have failed to be impressed with the growing sense of unity among all Christians. (I use the word unity here not in the sense of approach toward organic union but rather the sense of oneness, the sense of a call to common and united effort.) Three happenings alone have both manifested and developed that sense of unity or oneness: the meeting of two hundred and fifty delegates representing every communion—except the Roman—and every nation at the conference of the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship Through the Churches in 1925; the great gathering of five hundred delegates for the Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work at Stockholm in 1925; and the meeting of five hundred delegates at the World Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne in 1927. This increasing sense of unity among the Christian communions was even more strikingly manifested at the meetings of the continuation committees of these three conferences held at Prague this last August. In the light of these events hardly anyone can deny that there has been a remarkable growth in the consciousness of unity since the first Christian conference after the Armistice held at The Hague in 1919. At all of these gatherings the Eastern Orthodox Church has been represented and even between that communion and the Western churches a consciousness of unity has been born and is growing.

The meeting at Geneva last September of two hundred delegates, representing all the great religions of the world to consider the possibility of calling a Universal Peace Conference in 1930, naturally raises the question whether this conscious-

ness of oneness which has developed among the Christian communions is going to be enlarged to take in other than the Christian groups. Is it ever going to be possible to find enough sense of oneness to enter in any great, common action in the name of religion? I am sure these were the questions in the minds of many of us who went up to Geneva last September. This meeting at Geneva was called by the Church Peace Union (a Carnegie endowment for international peace). Two years ago its general secretary, Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, having had borne in on his mind by visits to the battlefields of France that followers of all religions had participated in the great war, asked himself the question whether it might not be possible to enlist followers of all religions in the crusade for the great peace. He laid before the trustees of the Church Peace Union the plan first, to sound out the leaders of the Christian churches and if there was any sign of enthusiasm among them, then the leaders of other religions, as to the possibility of bringing the leaders of all the great religions together to discover the attitudes of the various faiths on universal brotherhood and world peace. Then if it were possible to do this, would there be enough sense of unity to make any concerted action of the religions possible? The trustees of the Church Peace Union at first hesitated, rather because of the magnitude of the scheme than from any inherent objection to it. Some felt a little doubt as to the chance of much coming out of it, but they authorized Dr. Atkinson to go ahead and appoint a committee with Dean Shailer Mathews as chairman to coöperate with him. The answers to the hundreds of letters sent out were so enthusiastic—almost without exception—that the trustees warmed up to the enterprise and authorized the calling of a preliminary meeting of representatives of the various religions at Geneva in 1928 to discuss whether to proceed with the plans for such a conference or not and if the conference was decided upon, to set up a committee of arrangements. (A pamphlet containing extracts from the letters referred to above has been printed by the Church Peace Union and copies may be had from 70 Fifth Avenue, New York).

On September twelfth, 191 delegates turned up at Geneva and sat for three days in the Athenee taking counsel together. The fact that so many came and that every religion was represented was the first surprise. The fact that most of those who came were among the most outstanding and distinguished members of their sect was the second surprise. I ought to mention some of the names here. The Confucian representative was the president of the Confucian Association of China, the president of the Confucian College at Peking, and world famous authority on Confucianism, Dr. Chen Huan Chang; the chief representative of the Jewish faith was the great scholar Dr. Joseph H. Hertz, chief rabbi of the British Empire; Mohammedanism was represented by Maulve A. R. Dard, one of the outstanding leaders of the Moslem world and Mr. A. Yusuf Ali from India, a delegate to the League of Nations from India; Shintoism was represented by Professor T. Tomoeda of the Imperial University at Tokio; Buddhism by Professor E. Tomomatsu of Keio University, Japan; Zoroastrianism by Dr. Jal Dastur, C. Pavry, son of the high priest at Bombay.

The Christian communions were represented by men all of whom were prominent leaders in Life and Work and Faith and Order, or the World Alliance. Seven trustees of the Church Peace Union made the trip from America to Geneva to be present. Another significant thing was the type of laymen who were present and took active part in the deliberations, Dr. Nansen, Sir Francis Younghusband, Professor Gilbert Murray, Sir Willoughby Dickinson, Wickham Steed, Admiral Drury-Lowe, Montfort Mills, Julian Monod, and other equally distinguished men. Two of the prominent Roman Catholics who were present and addressed the meeting were Professor John A. Lapp of Marquette University of Milwaukee, and Mark Sagnier of Paris, the distinguished leader of the social service movement in the Roman communion in Europe.

I must confess that as I faced this group of all races, religions, colors, and languages, with the flowing robes of the Eastern brethren contrasting with the plain black coats of the Christians, I felt some apprehension as to just what was going

to happen. Could we find some common ground — even the belief in brotherhood and good will? After the first three addresses I think everybody present realized that not only was the discussion going to be carried on in the most sympathetic and appreciative mood, with all political, racial, and religious prejudices presented in calmest and kindest spirit, but that everybody had come up to the meeting as fully determined to listen in most appreciative frame of mind to what the others had to say as to present his own religion in its loftiest and broadest terms. When, on the second day, the conference divided itself into three committees to consider questions of means and methods and a statement to be issued to accompany the invitation to the great World Conference in 1930, this same spirit was manifested. One thing was evident before the end of the first day and that was that in spite of the problems to be solved and the risks to be run, everybody from both East and West was enthusiastic about the project and glad to have part in bringing it to a successful issue.

The addresses, coming from leaders of all faiths represented were, of course, extremely interesting to those of us who had not had close contact with the Eastern mind. We were all of us anxious to see on what points we stood together, especially what we shared in common on our outlook upon the oneness of mankind and our attitude toward war. As a matter of fact every representative of the non-Christian faiths spent most of his time in showing that from the beginning down to to-day his religion had as one of its chief and fundamental doctrines the inculcation of the oneness of all peoples, universal love and good will, the brotherhood of man and peace as a benign and positive virtue. Everyone of these religions condemned war. The Jewish speaker showed us how the great prophets were all preachers of a warless world. The Mohammedan showed us how the Koran was full of the praise of peace as the ideal state. The Buddhist told us that Buddha so detested the taking of life that he would not kill a fly. The Confucianist assured us that Confucius was the first pacifist. So it went on. The ardency with which every speaker claimed that his religion was the

great and original gospel of brotherhood and peace even evoked a smile now and then from all of us. Of course every speaker, including the Christians, dwelt upon the teaching and ideals of his religion rather than upon the practices of its adherents. When one heard the eloquent protestations of the Mohammedan that Mohammedanism denounced war, one remembered its bloody course in Africa, Turkey, and India. But he remembered that only ten years ago all the Christians of the world were engaged in trying to kill each other and that all vestiges of Christian love had been submerged in an orgy of hatred. No Christian present dared sit in judgment upon Mohammedanism. When I said to a Hindu: "How far in actual practice have the Indians, with their long records of terrible tribal wars, followed the peace principles of Buddha?" he answered with a smile: "About as far as the Christians have those of Jesus." And there was nothing to say. I remembered that during the world war a cartoon appeared in a Hindu paper showing a Hindu pointing to an account in an English journal of a terrible battle with the headline—"Fifty Thousand British, French, and Germans Slain" and saying to his friend: "See how these Christians love one another." Perhaps the Confucianists have a better record than any of us in the matter of practicing their doctrines, but they are catching up with the rest of us fast in denying them in practice. I imagine that one of the chief goods that may come of the World Conference when it comes will be the repentance on the part of every faith represented for sinning in this regard of professing love and practicing hate, teaching peace and practicing war. Perhaps each religion will be moved more earnestly to strive to bring its practice more closely into agreement with its doctrines.

In looking forward to the World Conference of a thousand representatives in 1930 three dangers have got to be guarded against, and the first of these is thoroughly met by the excellent statement issued by the meeting at Geneva. I refer to the danger that the conference turn into a congress of religion. This fear has been expressed in several quarters but the statement effectually disposes of it. It is not going to be a conference

of religion, not a seminar of comparative religions, not a place to assert the superiority of one religion over another, not an opportunity to be used for attempted conversion of followers of other religions to one's own. The statement points out in plainest language that it is to consider one subject and one only, namely, the possibility of finding a peace program on which all religions can unite. Each religion will be asked to state its teachings on peace; what it is doing to inculcate these teachings among its followers; how far can it go in uniting in a common crusade to establish international relationships on a peace footing and to outlaw war. The conference is called for that, and that alone.

The second danger is that, by inviting the Eastern religious leaders to a common congress wherein they will sit as equals of Christians, foreign missions will be endangered by unintentionally giving to the world and the religions invited the impression that we put them on the same plane as Christianity. This is a real danger and there is no doubt it will find expression in some Christian groups. But this danger can be effectually disposed of by remembering that the proposed conference is not interested in either approving or condemning religious beliefs, but, recognizing that big states and millions of peoples holds these religions, is interested solely in persuading them to throw in their weight and influence with the Christian religion in the crusade against war. An analogous case would be the inviting of Russia to join the League of Nations, as undoubtedly she will be asked. The other nations in the League do not by such an act show their approval of Sovietism. Most of them will go on condemning it just the same. They simply ask a government to unite with them in the attempt to establish peaceful methods of settling international disputes. There is no doubt that, should Russia come into active membership in the League, many of the governments in it would in time, from constant association with the Russians approach the whole subject of communism in a different spirit, and change their methods of missionary endeavor quite radically. They might even be willing to listen to their Soviet colleagues in the League

explain their political faith. So too, there is no doubt that in meeting representatives of all these Eastern faiths at a peace conference, where we shall sit down together for two weeks, we shall perhaps readjust our thoughts about the missionary approach, and find ourselves interested in presenting the Christian faith in sweet and kindly way to *friends*, who, like the scribe, are not far from the kingdom of God, rather than to *heathen*. (Some of us Christians found it very difficult to call the men we met at Geneva "heathen.") As a matter of fact the Missionary Conference at Jerusalem surprisingly revealed this new attitude toward the non-Christian faiths, and of course E. Stanley Jones, C. T. Andrews, and others have long been practicing this method.

The third danger is that the extreme Nationalists and the agitators may seize upon the congress as a plan to assert their views and assert them in such a way as to thwart the main issues. The only way to guard against this is to choose only delegates of calm and judicial temper. Of course the questions of nationalism and imperialism will come up, but they can be discussed as they were at Geneva—with calmness and without acrimony. Personally I think that if the congress is to accomplish anything the utmost frankness of expression must be allowed. Were I speaking I should claim the right of condemning the caste system in India and of saying that no religion which recognizes untouchables can be a pure gospel of brotherhood, but I should expect my Hindu brother to have the right to say that no religion which discriminates against Japanese and Chinese on the ground of color and makes the negro an "untouchable" has any right to call itself a pure gospel of brotherhood. It is better to err in the congress on the side of liberty of speech than to restrain anyone from fully opening his heart, but great care must be taken in choosing wise, sweet tempered, generous delegates who will speak without bitterness and with the world good in mind rather than that of their own race.

FREDERICK LYNCH.

CHRISTIAN UNITY AND THE GENERAL CONVENTION

BY REV. BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, JR., D. D.

Rector St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, Richmond, Va., and
Associate Editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly*

THE forty-ninth triennial General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church was held in Washington from October 10 to 25, 1928. In any attempt to assay the contribution that the convention made to the cause of Christian unity we need to distinguish between the spirit of unity that prevailed within the convention itself and sentiments that came to expression on the side of reunion with other Christian communions.

While the Bishops' Pastoral had some fine things to say on the call to unity; while a portion of a joint session of the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies was given over to the hearing of reports from delegates to the Lausanne Conference; while several important resolutions were passed in the interest of Christian reunion; it must be frankly admitted that, at this first General Convention held since the World Conference on Faith and Order, the subject of Christian unity was not in the foreground of the deliberations nor was there any surge of emotional enthusiasm over the general movement of Christian reunion.

I. UNITY WITHIN THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH

The notable feature of the convention was that it bore unmistakable witness to the comprehensive character and the underlying unity to the Protestant Episcopal Church within itself. The General Convention is a thoroughly representative body, both in the geographical distribution of its constituency and in the diversity of its churchmanship.

The Episcopal Church is fortunate in that it has not perpetuated the sectional divisions of the war between the

states. There is no Episcopal Church, north and south — every state in the union and all of the territories and possessions were represented among the bishops and the clerical and lay deputies from the seventy-two dioceses and the twenty domestic missionary jurisdictions. In addition, there were representatives from twelve foreign missionary jurisdictions. Meeting simultaneously with the General Convention were the Woman's Auxiliary and various allied organizations of the church.

The comprehensive character of this church, however, was shown not only in its geographical representation, but also in the variety of the types of churchmanship represented. Among its bishops and deputies were Anglo-Catholics and Evangelical low churchmen; conservatives and liberals in theological interpretation and in the application of the ethics of the gospel to social questions.

Nevertheless, I can testify that the dominant note of this General Convention was its spirit of harmony and unity amidst all its diversity. At the great opening service, held out of doors on the Cathedral grounds, it was estimated there were 20,000 persons in attendance. There was the procession of choir, clergy, and bishops singing in unison with the congregation, "Like a mighty army moves the church of God; we are not divided, all one body we, one in hope, and doctrine, one in charity." When one looked out over the vast throng seated and standing upon the sloping lawns, one could not but think of the Galilean hills, when the Master moved among men. There was the quiet dignity and simplicity of the Prayer Book service — the spirit of reverence touched with the deep emotion of the vast throng. Bishop Anderson, of Chicago, reached a high note in his sermon, declaring that the chief function of the church is to exalt Christ above nationalism, and naturalism, and humanism, and behaviorism, and the culture and civilization of the day. By fixing our minds upon Him, we would rise above the lesser loyalties that divide us to-day in church and state. It was a noble plea, and its spirit set the keynote of the convention and made its influence felt in all of the deliberations.

The convention met with the popular expectation of partisan controversy over the revision of the Prayer Book, and

especially over the question of the Thirty-nine articles. Popular expectation was, however, disappointed, for there was a spirit of magnanimity and fair play manifested—and in no instance more so than in the case of the Thirty-nine Articles, when all schools of thought and churchmanship united and voted unanimously to retain the articles as an appendix to the Prayer Book, in order that in this twentieth century, with great issues confronting the church, we should not give way to bitter controversy over a sixteenth century platform.

The convention was meeting, too, in the capital of the nation, in the midst of a heated political campaign, but partisan politics did not once enter into the public deliberations.

II. CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE CONVENTION TO THE CAUSE OF CHRISTIAN REUNION

As has already been noted, the cause of Christian reunion was not in the forefront of the deliberations of the General Convention. Its main task was to complete the revision of the Book of Common Prayer, which has been proceeding since 1913. Its prevailing spirit was to manifest unity within its own household. There were, however, several significant expressions of sentiment which were adopted by the convention without any prolonged discussion.

1. *Report on the Lausanne Conference.* In the House of Bishops the bishop of New York reported for the Commission on Faith and Order, speaking most enthusiastically of the experiences and success of the Lausanne Conference. He also recommended the following resolutions, which were passed, or referred to committees:

That the presiding bishop be requested to lead the General Convention in a great corporate act of thanksgiving for the conference at Lausanne. That a message of congratulation and thanks be sent to the continuation committee of the conference. That the aforesaid committee be informed that we feel that the conference should be repeated, and that if it is this church will gladly take part therein. That the Commission on Faith and Order be continued, to report to the next convention, and meantime to hold conferences with similar commissions of other religious bodies.

At the final joint session of the Houses of Bishops and Deputies, the first part of the meeting was given to the Commission on Faith and Order. Bishop Manning of New York, Bishop Parsons of California, Mr. Frederic C. Morehouse, editor of *The Living Church*, Mr. George Zabriskie of New York, and the Rev. Dr. George Craig Stewart made reports on the Lausanne Conference. Unfortunately no time was provided for a general discussion. The impression created by these reports on the minds of many was that the conference had been chiefly engaged in recording the differences between the various churches rather than in making any constructive advance toward reunion.

2. *Commission on conference with the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches.* Following the report in the House of Bishops on the Lausanne Conference, the Rt. Rev. Charles H. Brent, bishop of Western New York, who had presided at the Lausanne Conference, offered the following resolutions as an addition to the report of the Commission on Faith and Order :

Resolved, That the Methodist Churches, North and South, and the Presbyterian Churches, North and South, in this country be invited by the church to appoint commissions to sit with a similar commission of General Convention in the consideration of matters of Christian morality, looking toward organic unity:

Resolved, That a commission of three bishops, three presbyters, and three laymen chosen from our younger theologians, be chosen to act with the above proposed commissions, and to report to the next General Convention.

In offering the resolutions Bishop Brent said that these resolutions were presented after long and careful thought of all sides of the subject; that he had chosen these especial bodies because the differences between us were slight; and he was convinced that, if we could sit side by side with them, looking for points of similarity and not for differences, the same kind of experience would come to us as came to many at Lausanne, and we would be surprised at the results achieved.

The House of Bishops passed the motions unanimously, and the House of Deputies concurred in the action after comparatively little discussion. The question was raised in the House of Deputies as to the reason for limiting such overtures

to the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches. In answer to this query, it was pointed out that these bodies were chosen as being most receptive to the subject, the Methodists having a close family relationship with Anglicans and the Presbyterians being especially interested in a ministry of succession. The Rev. Dr. Talbot Rogers, of Harrisburg, stated that such a proposal is, in a measure, an answer to those who have criticized the Commission on Faith and Order for seeming to accomplish little.

The New York *Churchman*, commenting editorially on this action of the General Convention, speaks of it as coming down to earth. "We rejoice that at last this church proposes to do more than talk of its deep desire for unity, exalting itself as the only fit medium for the union of Catholic and Protestant, but confessing to a congenital paralysis in all those limbs which might lead in the Protestant direction. A certain degree of unity with the Greeks has already been accomplished; and there are some who need not travel far to go to Rome. But we have tirelessly insisted that whatever the theoretical links may be which seem to unite us to the Greek Church and separate us from the 'Protestant sects,' if we ask the practical clergyman or layman instead of the sequestered theological professor, he will confess that he finds himself less an alien among the Protestant ministers than among Greek priests and patriarchs. And even those who might question this assertion will agree that in a country so largely Protestant as ours, a unity which excludes them is a vain delusion. Whatever may become of Bishop Brent's single step it is worth a hundred vague declarations of exalted ideals."

3. *Coöperation with the Federal Council of Churches.* A somewhat prolonged and vigorous discussion was precipitated in the House of Deputies following a motion that the deputies concur with the House of Bishops in approving the coöperation of this church with the Federal Council of Churches' Commissions on Evangelism and on the Eastern Churches. Mr. Wickersham, of New York, expressed himself emphatically in favor of complete coöperation on the part of the Protestant Episcopal Church with the Federal Council of Churches. Mr. George Wharton Pepper, of Pennsylvania, took the opposition. Mr.

Morehouse, of Milwaukee, believed that such approval would set back greatly the progress we have made in friendly relations with the Eastern Churches. Dean Robbins, of New York, stated that he had doubted the wisdom of such approval until he had received the recent assurance from some of the Council's members that in the matter of evangelism our coöperation would not indicate agreement but a coöperation at the same time. At the close of the discussion the House voted in favor of coöperation with the Federal Council's Commission on Evangelism, but opposed coöperation with the Federal Council's Commission on Eastern Churches.

4. *The Bishops' Pastoral.* The Bishops' call to unity, which is voiced in the Pastoral Letter of the House of Bishops, read at the closing service of the General Convention, is printed in this number of *The Christian Union Quarterly*, with comment by the editor. Accordingly, I record here only two comments on the Pastoral expressed in editorials of church papers. *The Living Church* declares that, "It is one of the best presentations of the call to unity, in our own communion, in Christianity in general, and in the world, that we have seen for many a day. And at the reading of it to the General Convention, the beautiful delivery and clear intonation of the bishop of California made it doubly effective. The hideousness of disunity that stands in the way of the realization of the Christ-ideal stood forth as almost never before."

The New York *Churchman* has this to say: "It is a pleasure to *The Churchman* to be able to give its heartiest commendation to the Pastoral Letter of the House of Bishops, for that letter reflects the new spirit made manifest in this convention. It is a far cry from the Dallas Pastoral Letter (which many of the clergy refused point-blank to read to their congregations) to the letter issued from this convention. In place of the chilling, dogmatic phrases of the Dallas Pastoral, we have a frank consideration of the wide differences of opinion in the Episcopal Church and a high-minded plea that those who hold these opinions, whether leaning to the Catholic or Protestant emphasis, may recognize the large and inclusive fellowship of the church."

BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, JR.

METHODIST PROPOSALS FOR UNION

BY BISHOP WILLIAM F. McDOWELL, D. D., LL. D.

Resident Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C.

THE General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Kansas City in May took action on the subject of interdenominational relations which is more thoroughgoing and far-reaching than any previous action taken by that church.

First: It unified all of its various bodies which have to do with interdenominational relations and created a new commission of thirty-seven members to which all matters relating to church union, unification, federation, and other related subjects should be referred. This commission consists of seven bishops, fifteen other ministers, and fifteen laymen.

Second: It instructed this commission to make a careful study of the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work, the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and other organizations seeking to promote understanding and coöperation between the various branches of the Christian church. It particularly approved state, regional, and national conferences with reference to union.

Third: It authorized this commission of thirty-seven to act for the Methodist Episcopal Church in all questions of comity within the United States and earnestly recommended prompt and effective measures of dealing with over-churched as well as under-churched communities.

Fourth: It then authorized this commission to make overtures to and receive overtures from like-minded churches looking toward closer coöperation and union.

It will be seen from these various items that the General Conference meant to cover the whole subject thoroughly and in a broad, generous spirit. This generous spirit reaches in every direction and toward every other like-minded body. In its breadth it covers every essential phase of interdenominational relationship from coöperation with existing denomi-

nations on through federation to actual union. The conference did not mean to omit or exclude anybody in relationship or in method that would bring about a closer relation between the Methodist Episcopal and other churches. The one great regret that hung over it through the entire session was due to the failure of the negotiations with the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, which came so near succeeding and failed by such a narrow margin. Even with reference to that, however, the attitude of the conference was one of hope and confident expectation.

It is interesting that one of the items acutely in the mind of the conference was the item of a closer relation with the Presbyterian Church. A memorial signed by a very representative list of persons looking toward union with the Presbyterians was received with immense favor, favor that seemed to be unanimous. It is also significant that the conference gave this commission such broad instructions as those represented in the authorization to make overtures to and receive overtures from like-minded churches looking toward closer coöperation and union. The conference had in mind to give its commission instructions which would not be technical and narrow, and the commission received these instructions in that spirit.

The commission met in Philadelphia on November 21st and subdivided itself in accordance with the action of the conference. One sub-committee has to do with other churches than Methodist churches, one with Methodist churches, one with questions of comity, and one with the bodies like the Federal Council, the Lausanne Conference, and the Stockholm Conference. The committee on relations with other than Methodist churches has already begun negotiations with a like committee from the Presbyterian Church and has made prompt response to the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church as taken in Washington so that conversations between these three denominations will be under way at a very early date.

This I think fairly interprets the action of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church upon this very great subject.

WILLIAM F. MCDOWELL.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE ROCHESTER MEETING OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL TO CHRISTIAN UNITY

BY REV. JOHN MILTON MOORE, D.D.

General Secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in
America, New York

IN years to come it is highly probable that the quadrennial meeting of the Federal Council held in Rochester in December, 1928, will be considered an important milestone on the road to Christian unity. For a year, preparatory studies had been carried forward by a committee of one hundred, whose appointment was authorized by the Federal Council at its executive committee meeting in Cleveland in January, 1928. At that meeting it had been agreed that "the approaching twentieth anniversary of the founding of the Federal Council of the Churches and the growing interest in church coöperation and Christian unity make particularly appropriate that there should be this year a candid examination of the present status of the churches in their relations to the community, the nation, and the world, with particular reference to present and possible coöperative life and work."

Two conclusions were reached by the committee of one hundred in the early weeks of its existence. The first was that Christian coöperation and unity should be the central topic for discussion at Rochester and that the forenoons of the quadrennial meeting should be devoted to conference and general discussion. Representative church men and women, not members of the Federal Council, were invited to share in these discussions, it being understood of course that only such conclusions of the conference discussions as were acted upon in administrative sessions of the Federal Council should be regarded as expressing officially the mind of the Council itself.

Two documents were issued for the use of those who should participate in these discussions — a data book which was prepared by the research department of the Federal Council and provided a factual basis which should show current trends in life and thought affecting religion, with special reference to the church and rural life, the church and the city, the approach to the world community, and the present status of the co-operative movement in religion. The second was a syllabus entitled “Christian Unity — To What Extent is it Possible? What Actual Forms Should it Take?” This was widely circulated months in advance of the meeting and was used in many parts of the country by individuals and groups. It raised three major questions — first, “Should we be satisfied with the method of coöperation, as embodied in the Federal Council, the Home Mission Council, the Foreign Missions Conference, the International Council of Religious Education, the state and city councils of churches, and other agencies for common tasks?” This question was intended to discover whether *ability to coöperate* was considered a sufficient expression of Christian unity. The second main question was: “Should we now take steps to secure the extension of the present partial expression of federal union of the churches, especially as exhibited in the Federal Council of the Churches, to the end that it may become a complete expression of federal union after the general type of the union of the several states, retaining their independent authority and responsibility in large areas of work but delegating certain defined functions to the federal body?” It was well understood that there were many points at which the analogy of the states in their relation to the central federal union could not be at all applicable. The question was meant to inquire whether there might be a clue to the solution of our church problem in the way in which the several states of the American union preserved their traditions, backgrounds, loyalties, and liberties, while at the same time expressing their essential unity and developing a national consciousness. The third question was: “What can we learn from the movements in our time that are seeking to unite all the churches into one body with one central organization and control?” The com-

mittee of one hundred met at Rochester for one day preceding the quadrennial meeting. On the basis of replies received from individuals and groups that had used the syllabus they concluded: first, that there was widespread and deep appreciation of the abiding value of the work of the Federal Council and of the necessity of continuing the performance of its various functions; second, that the union of all the churches into one body, with a central organization and control, did not appear to be practical at present, whatever the future may hold; third, that there was considerable evidence of a growing desire for the organic union of closely allied bodies; fourth, that there was also an evident and growing desire for the enlargement of the scope of our coöperative life and action in order that our essential unity might be fully expressed without the sacrifice of denominational existence and freedom. It is to be noted that these are not conclusions of the Federal Council but only of the committee of one hundred on the basis of the inquiry that it conducted.

The open forum conference which was held on four successive forenoons in which the greater part of the time was given to discussion from the floor in five-minute talks, began with a consideration of the approach of the church to the country community. On the basis of changed living conditions, due to migration, changes in population, power machinery, tenancy, etc., as shown in the data book, the discussion proceeded along these two lines — what are the present elements of strength and weakness in the life and work of the churches in the new conditions, and what difference would it make if the Christian forces were more closely unified in strategy and resources.

In the same way the approach of the church to the modern city and to the world community was considered. On the basis of these discussions, the heart of the problem was reached on the third morning when the subject of the approach of the churches to one another was considered. The questions that were asked by the program committee were: Are they giving full enough expression to Christian fellowship, to the development of common worship, to the values that accrue from co-

operation in service? How satisfying and effective have been the experiments in fellowship and in coöperative or united activity during the last two decades? And does the experience of the last two decades suggest still greater values that would be realized under a much larger conception and practice of Christian coöperation and unity? It will be seen that this was the finest sort of preparation for the discussions of the concluding session of the conference which was on a coöperative policy for to-day and to-morrow. Questions raised for consideration by the conference were: How can weaknesses be removed and elements of strength be enhanced? What specific advance steps in fellowship, in organization, and in activities should be contemplated during the next decade? What appears to be a desirable goal and how rapidly should we advance toward it?

It was recognized that while the number of groups and individuals using the syllabus and reporting on it was considerable and came from all parts of the country, it was neither large enough nor representative enough to indicate clearly what the sense of the constituency of the Federal Council might be. The fact that those who did reply were almost two to one in favor of taking steps to secure the extension of the federal union of the churches was, to say the least, full of significance. The most hopeful indication of progress from the points of those who are praying and working for a larger Christian unity lay in the action that was unanimously taken not only in the informal conference but later on recommendation of the business committee by the Federal Council itself in one of its administrative sessions, that a committee be appointed "to study the whole subject of the scope of its functions and modification of its structure; the committee to report annually on its progress to the executive committee and finally to the next quadrennial meeting of the Council."

The Federal Council has been proceeding for twenty years under distinct constitutional limitations which declare that it shall "have no authority over the constituent bodies adhering to it; but its province shall be limited to the expression of its counsel and the recommending of a course of action in matters of common interest to the churches, local councils and indi-

vidual Christians. . . . It has no authority to draw up a common creed or form of government or of worship or in any way to limit the full autonomy of the Christian bodies adhering to it."

At the same time, in the statement of its object, the constitution puts first "to express the fellowship and catholic unity of the Christian Church." The question that is now squarely before the Council is whether the new experience of fellowship and mutual appreciation that has resulted from two decades of fine coöperation and the great and growing interest in Christian unity that has found expression everywhere during recent years, call now for changes in its functions or modification of its structure. To put it in other words, is there a way of expressing real obvious Christian unity that requires no sacrifice of loyalties or liberties that are precious and that have real spiritual value to those who cherish them?

Of course such a body as the Federal Council will and ought to proceed carefully. It has produced values in friendly coöperation that must be conserved. Moreover, it is not an independent, irresponsible body that may freely blaze new trails and try experiments as it may determine. It was officially created and is officially controlled by the twenty-eight communions that constitute it and it must therefore go as rapidly or as slowly as they shall determine.

The action taken at Rochester, however, may fairly be interpreted as expressing not only a willingness but a desire to explore the possibilities of Christian unity that are wrapped up in the Federal Council philosophy. This is the more evident to one who shared in the free and frank discussions that took place and noted that neither in the open forum conference, in the business committee, nor in the administrative session itself was there a single vote against the proposed inquiry. What many believe these possibilities to be was indicated in the report of the general secretary at Rochester "Twenty Years in Retrospect" in which he said, "The whole movement for Christian unity is finding its way now into the path that we have followed whatever the future may have in store."

JOHN MILTON MOORE.

PROTESTANT HIGH CHURCH- MANSHIP

BY REV. ROBERT A. ASHWORTH, D. D.

Minister of the Baptist Church of the Redeemer, Yonkers, N. Y.

THE loyalty to his church of the good Catholic, whether Roman, Orthodox, or Anglican, cannot but be very impressive to every thoughtful Protestant observer. It is an element of strength which Protestantism lacks and which it appears to be quite unable to secure.

The hold of the church upon the Catholic springs from his belief that it is a divine institution, established by Jesus Christ and endowed by Him with his own authority, transmitted through the bishops in succession from the apostles. The sacraments are the appointed means of divine grace, without which there is no salvation, and their administration is committed to the church. Men can thus find access to God only through the church; all its dogmas are divine revelations; faith is the acceptance, without inquiry, of what the church proposes to be believed; and it is the duty of the Christian to submit his reason and commit his soul to its authority. It is no wonder that the institution of the church bulks so large in the consciousness of those who hold this view of its origin and function.

Since Protestants cannot accept the premises upon which such a theory is founded, they cannot give this place to the authority of the church. They argue, and soundly, that whatever authority the church may possess must be dependent upon its fidelity to truths which only the original New Testament witnesses could know at first hand. Naturally they ask why, since the testimony of these original witnesses is still available, they should apply to the church or to the councils, which, at best, are only intermediary links in the chain of testimony, when they can go directly to the source and build their faith immediately upon the New Testament itself. The Protestant

believes, moreover, that he may delve deeper yet, and seek truth at the source from which these first disciples drew, namely, from a first-hand experience of God. The testimony of the Spirit of God, witnessing with our spirits, and not the teaching of the church, is the source of authority and the ground of certitude for Protestants.

It must be admitted, however, so far as the institution of the church is concerned, that if the Catholic conception of it as a primary source of religious truth claims more for it than either history or philosophy can warrant, the Protestant approach to truth minimizes the importance of the church and its witness to such a degree as to render it almost negligible. The reformed churches, reacting against the Catholic doctrine of authority, went to the opposite extreme, and stripped the church not only of all authority but of the larger part of its influence. Since, as he believes, access to God may be had directly, without the mediation of bishop, sacrament, or institution, the evangelical Protestant is in danger of concluding that the church is non-essential—a desirable institution, to be sure, holding those of a like high purpose together, combining their efforts for the spread of the kingdom of God, serving to keep aflame the fires of individual devotion, but in no sense necessary to the fulfilment of the divine purpose for mankind, and without any authority whatsoever over the minds or consciences of its members. According to the definition of a Baptist scholar widely known and honored, the church is “simply the voluntary association for mutual help and service of the world of those who have been saved.”

This low doctrine of the church is a principal source of weakness in Protestantism to-day. How often we hear the ideal of the kingdom exalted to the disparagement of the church! How difficult the Protestant finds it to compose cogent and persuasive reasons for joining the church! He can point out only the desirability of the presence of the church in a community, or the need of companionship on the Christian way. Or take it in the matter of church attendance, where the Catholic so evidently knows what to say and to what motives to

appeal. What has the evangelical Protestant to say to those who do not seem to find church attendance necessary—who say they can worship God before the orifice of a radio loud speaker, or in “God’s first temples,” the forest groves or open country? He may point out the spiritual helpfulness of church attendance, the essentially social character of worship, and the necessity that men should attend its services if the church is to survive. Now these are all, doubtless, good reasons for the admirable practices to which they apply, but they have in them no single note of a divine sanction. How much more vigorous and effective is the argument of the Catholic high churchman, with his appeal to a divine and authoritative institution! It may be that we cannot accept the Catholic doctrine of the church, but we recognize how powerful is the claim of the church upon those who can and do accept it.

Now I raise the question whether the comparative weakness of Protestants in this regard grows inevitably out of their genius, or whether, as a matter of fact, their own premises do not demand that they shall reject their emasculated conception of the church and take very much higher ground. Surely the conviction that the church is divinely founded and commissioned, that it is endowed with certain specific powers and responsibilities, that it is essential to the progress and to the very existence of the kingdom of God on earth, and that it is the representative on earth of its divine Lord is not dependent upon acceptance of the dogma of apostolic succession. The church has the power of the keys; it binds and looses; it is authorized to assure the penitent of the forgiveness of their sins. The church, as a corporate body, enjoys the promised presence of the Spirit of God, and has a right to believe that it will be led by the Spirit in the pursuit of truth. It is not necessary to submit blindly to the authority of the church, nor to hold that it has always been right, to believe that in its corporate testimony, however embodied, we have a norm of spiritual truth by which our individualism and subjectivism should be corrected.

Such a heightening of the estimate of the nature and function of the church in the consciousness of Protestants in

general would have two very important and desirable effects. In the first place, it would greatly advance the cause of Christian unity. The differences that divide the communions at this point, in their conceptions of the church, constitute the supreme obstacle to the further advancement of this great movement. An overwhelmingly large proportion of Christendom to-day, as throughout history, holds to the catholic conception. Whenever we find an idea that has been held so continuously, and by such multitudes, as is the case with this doctrine of the church, we may safely conclude, not that it is wholly true, to be sure, but that there is enough truth in it to preserve it. Without question, there are truths emphasized peculiarly by Protestants into which Catholics might well inquire more diligently: it may be that Protestants, to their own great profit, might learn something at this point from their Catholic friends. Protestants cannot accept the assumptions that underlie the Catholic doctrine of the church, but on their own premises they may become higher churchmen than they are at present, and rise to a more nearly adequate conception of the place that the church should occupy in Christian experience. Nothing would do more to bridge the gap that now separates the major divisions of Christendom.

But the recovery of an adequate doctrine of the church on the part of Protestants, who lost it at the Reformation for reasons not difficult to decipher, would do more than draw together the scattered fragments of the church universal; it would give to the Protestant communions themselves the sense of a divine authority and mission which now they too often lack. It would instill a more robust tone into the pronouncements of the churches, while giving to them a new sense of responsibility for those pronouncements and greater caution in their formulation. It would impart a new self-respect. And it would inspire a deeper loyalty in its constituency.

The Christian Church has been a long time in the world: it did not spring up yesterday. "The church's one foundation, is Jesus Christ her Lord"; but on that foundation Paul and the apostles built a durable structure, and a noble sequence of

saints, sages, and martyrs have added to it through the centuries; and if we overlook the contributions of the ages that have intervened in a desire to honor the New Testament, we discard a valuable portion of our heritage. If Protestantism is to render the largest possible service to the future, it must pay more deference to the past. Individualism has run wild: the right of private judgment has degenerated into license for every untutored mind. The barriers erected by the wisdom of the past to ward off spiritual anarchy have been cast down, and a considerable portion of Protestantism takes on the appearance of "untamed mustangs in an unfenced pasture." Ignorance or contempt of the past cuts the root through which the church draws much of its sustenance, and condemns it to the necessity of seeking subsistence from the atmosphere, so often sterile, that surrounds it at the moment.

To restore the church to its rightful place in the affections and loyalty of the Protestant world is the next great task to which we must set our hands. Anything that belittles the church or that tends further to divide it is hostile to the cause of Christ. We must preserve and cultivate a sense of historic continuity, which sees the church, while reaching into the future, to be rooted in the past, and must put a new value upon the traditions that enrich it. While refusing to base the authority of the church upon any artificial transmission of grace by physical contact in the laying on of hands, we must recognize that it has authority, growing out of its age, its character, and its commission, and must listen to its voice, lest, ignoring it, we miss the accents of its Lord. The next great forward movement of Protestantism waits for the rise of a new spirit of Protestant high churchmanship.

ROBERT A. ASHWORTH.

THE RATIONALE OF THE COMMUNITY CHURCH

BY OSCAR JACOBY RANDALL

Vice-President of the Community Church Workers in the United States,
Washington, D. C.

As one looks about and thoughtfully observes the divided state of the Protestant branch of the church of Jesus Christ, he will be more or less definitely conscious of one of several possible reactions: (1) he may try to justify it on the ground that denominationalism has been and still is a blessing; (2) he may deplore the situation but despair of ever making it any better; (3) he may be thankful it is no worse and try to preserve the *status quo*; (4) he may be confessedly bewildered; or (5) he may be convinced that it is time to change the order and, on the assumption that it can be done, actively commit himself to the undertaking.

Speaking for an ever increasing number: we represent those who have taken the last position; but, more specifically, we are among those who believe that the community church, as it shall be developed, shall constitute at least one of the approaches toward the achievement of a considerable measure of visible organic Christian unity.

The term "the community church" is used in a generic sense, only. A particular community church anywhere is primarily an affair of that community. In all probability, there is not another church just like it anywhere else. "The community church" is, however, the term—more convenient than exact—which we apply to the fifteen hundred community churches in the United States as we think of them collectively, although they have no collective organic existence. Each one is as separate and distinct from all others as if it were the only one.

We regard a community church as more than the temporary solution of a merely local problem, more than a makeshift to tide over an acute situation until a denominational church—even by comity agreements—can take its place. We believe that the principles underlying the community church will furnish the solution of every local church problem, so that when such problems are thus solved denominational difficulties, as we know them to-day, will no longer exist.

The rationale of the community church will be readily discovered in a study of its phenomena. These will include its *raison d'être*, its spirit, its objectives, its successes, its failures, its variations, its present status, its problems, and its possibilities. In this instance we can no more than glance at these characteristics, and hardly that at some of them.

The immediate and insistent reason for the organization of community churches is the widespread prevalence of a condition which they attempt to cure. One hundred and seventy-seven years ago, Phillip Doddridge, in the preface of his *Rise and Progress*, wrote:

I pray God to give to all his ministers and people more and more of the spirit of wisdom, and of love and of a sound mind; and to remove far from us those mutual jealousies and animosities which hinder our acting with that unanimity which is necessary in order to the successful carrying out of our common warfare against the enemies of Christianity. We may be sure these enemies will never fail to make their own advantage of our multiplied divisions and severe contests with each other.

Such apparently candid acknowledgment of the evil of the disunion of Protestant forces, reëchoed many a time since Doddridge's day, has not resulted in a mitigation of the evil. Since his vigorous protest was made denominations have multiplied and not until quite recently has the matter been seriously dealt with. Much that has been done has been academic and equivocal. Indeed, as one notes the inconsistent and vacillating attitudes of some professed friends and advocates of unity and of church union,—including many denominational legislative bodies,—there is brought to mind the famous clock, by which, when the hour hand pointed to six, the minute hand to four-

thirty, and it struck nine, it was understood that the time was fifteen minutes past twelve.

The ultimate sub-stratum on which the community church rests is the growing realization that religion, on the human side at least, is after all an exceedingly simple matter, and in its essential qualities and manifestations surprisingly similar in all persons, however differing in temperament and antecedents. Alongside of this conviction emerges another, kindred thereto: that religion is at the very center of life and touches constantly and intimately all our varied concerns, shared or unshared. Logically, then, comes the further thought that in morals and religion the social unit to which we belong—the community, which is a cross section of the whole people—should seek its satisfactions and find its means of expression precisely as it does in other communal matters: together, unifiedly, and in fraternal mood; not separately, clannishly, or individualistically. It is clearly apprehended that religion should not be regarded as belonging outside the periphery of community consciousness, a kind of outcast among the great, albeit common and everyday, interests of the people; but that it should be seen to be the centripital force which unifies and coördinates all that is vital to life.

As the boundaries of this immanently localized consciousness are pushed back until they coincide with those of larger areas—as, for instance, the suburban consciousness expands until it embraces the life of the whole city, or that of a village grows to the dimensions of a county—the all-inclusive spirit of unity, oneness, is seen to be applicable. The same is true of those still wider areas whose horizons bound the state, the nation, the world. If God's people should and can have the consciousness of unity in the small community, why not in the larger and, ultimately, in the largest community? Such a comprehensive consciousness of unity facilitates the rapid advance of the kingdom of heaven, but it inexorably demands an adequate organ of expression. Nothing less than a united church will meet the demand.

Although during the past half-century and more there were a few isolated so-called union churches organized in various parts of the country, they were for the most part understood to be temporary expedients and compromises. Not until after the world war did there appear to be a trend toward the organization of strictly community churches spontaneous and general enough properly to be called a movement. Since then the long-dormant sentiment in favor of some degree of practical Christian unity has been crystallized into visibility and expressional form in more than fifteen hundred communities, widely scattered in this land. Besides this identified number, it is reasonable to believe that, although not catalogued in any files, there are hundreds of other communities in which this laboratory or clinical method of studying and solving the problems involved is being successfully carried on.

The success of these community churches is worth noting. It is found that the response to the appeal of such churches on the part of the population contiguous thereto has uniformly been sincere, generous, and enthusiastic. Although handicapped by the absence of what many regard as sacred sectarian traditions or of a sense of solidarity, and all the while conscious that the enterprise was at best in its developmental stage, larger numbers have become identified with community churches than would have done so with denominational churches in the same localities. The explanation is that, whatever the community churches lack, they possess something else of infinitely greater value.

To aver that community churches have invariably succeeded would be plainly untrue. But the occasional failure has generally been due to conditions other than the repudiation or abandonment of the original idea of unity. Inefficient leadership, financial stress, premature or immature decisions involving policies, etc. — not to ignore the all too frequent official ecclesiastical opposition — have in a few instances been disastrous. The degree, however, in which many churches, without guidance or help from outside sources, have developed strength and permanency, is not much short of phenomenal.

Community churches symbolize and emphasize the idea that questions of moral and spiritual significance have the same interest for and applicability to all religious groups alike. The dominant themes of the church have no sectarian flavor or bias—or should not have. The same principle applies to the real prophets of the church, past and present. The qualities which have made them great also make them the possession of all communions. Further evidence of the identity of purpose now existent among the denominations is found in the growing practice of uniting in evangelistic endeavor, teacher-training, vacation and week-day schools of religious education, thanksgiving services, summer evening preaching missions, and the like. All of these agencies promote that which is vital to religion. If temporary union is not undesirable, why should permanent union be? The community church says it isn't and acts accordingly.

The spirit and the objectives of the community church movement from its beginning are disclosed in a statement contained in the findings of the third national biennial conference of the Community Church Workers U.S.A. held in 1926:

We have an abiding antipathy toward becoming another denomination. We seek rather to be used of heaven to fuse together some of the many and ultimately all of the branches of the church into some form of unity, and we will count it a joy to lose our identity in such a fusion. In this spirit we urgently appeal to all the denominations to take definite steps to that end.

The essence of this declaration has been reiterated on every suitable occasion. The most recent was in response to a telegram of greeting from the annual meeting of Ohio Congregationalists to the biennial conference of Community Church Workers, in which reference was made to the prospect of union with the Christian denomination and the hope expressed that the community churches might become a part of the union enterprise. In their reply the Community Church Workers said:

. . . . The interest you have in the larger union of Christian people is heartily reciprocated by this body. It has been always our hope that some

merger of churches similar to that in Canada might be established in America which would include community churches. The Community Church Workers is a fellowship of individuals and cannot bind community churches by its action. But we, as individuals, pledge coöperation in church union projects. It is the belief of many prominent members of our organization that community churches should coalesce with any considerable merger of denominations that may be achieved. . . .

There are three prevailing types of community church: the denominational, which, while bearing a sectarian name, is in many other important respects, undenominational; the federated, which is made up of two or more denominational churches that have modified their differences and merged into a community church; the independent—un-, inter-, or super-denominational,—which is in no official way connected with any ecclesiastical body. There are about as many churches of independent type as of the other two types combined.

The members of these community churches—but not the churches themselves—are eligible to membership in the organization known as Community Church Workers of the United States of America. This organization and a monthly journal, privately owned, are the only means outside the churches themselves by which the ideals of the movement are regularly given articulate expression.

Of persons who are disposed to think that in new or sparsely settled communities community churches may have some success, but that in established localities with considerable population they are not satisfactory, it is pertinent to inquire: If a community church may successfully minister to a limited number for a limited period, what is there inherent in such a church to nullify its appeal when its membership is increased or its years multiplied? Why does quantity negate quality? When two small communities, each with its own community church, grow together into a larger community; or, when a young settlement starting with a community church develops into a vigorous small town or becomes a prominent city suburb, is it time to disintegrate the community churches and out of their fragments set up churches with denominational labels and under denominational control?

It is not surprising that many who have had no opportunity to observe community churches in actual operation have imagined that the differing antecedents of their members as to doctrine, modes of worship, and so on, would constitute insurmountable obstacles to their successful carrying on. The record of community churches entirely discounts this notion. These very diversities have rather tended to give breadth of view and enrichment to the churches' life and ministry. Indeed, this in itself is a by-product worth almost the major undertaking.

Whatever may be said in defense of the sectarianism of the past—and much has been said that is either plainly erroneous or open to serious question—surely, no Christian statesman would to-day advocate the further extension of the order. Nobody is desirous of a new denomination. Nor would anybody attempt to maintain that we now have precisely the right number—neither too many nor too few. But if, as is universally conceded, we have too many denominations, why should not everybody encourage an effort to reduce the number thereof by a process of weaving together several strands into a cable of greater strength and usefulness? The community churches of our country are definite efforts to approximate this result right at home and right away, without waiting for formal ecclesiastical action to initiate or direct it.

Recent efforts to give new impetus to what is termed church comity constitute at once a partial justification of and a potential menace to community church ideals. On the one hand, church comity undertakes to establish here and there a pseudo-community church while giving its tacit approval to the perpetuation of denominationalism. Completely, although not admittedly, disavowing the principles and practice of genuine Christian unity, church comity seeks to compel the Christian constituency of each community to accept a church and to become identified with a denomination prescribed for and certified to it by an outside agency. By agreement among ecclesiastical heads, there is thus foisted upon these localities whatever brand of modified sectarian church these dictators, in conformity with a law of give and take—based mostly upon economical

and efficiency considerations — decide to put into the particular territories under treatment. If agencies outside a community can on such a basis determine what kind of a church that community should have, it is not apparent that the kind is a matter of much importance. If the kind is not important, why not permit the community to decide? Then you have a community church and real church comity, as well as Christian unity by local option.

OSCAR JACOBY RANDALL.

THERE WAS A MAN

There was a man who saw God face to face:
 His countenance and vestments evermore
 Glowed with a light that never shone before
 Saving from him who saw God face to face.
 And men, anear him for a little space,
 Were sorely vexed at the unwonted light.
 Those whom the light did blind rose angrily;
 They bore his body to a mountain height
 And nailed it to a tree; then went their way.
 And he resisted not nor said them nay,
 Because that he had seen God face to face.

There was a man who saw Life face to face;
 And ever as he walked from day to day,
 The deathless mystery of being lay
 Plain as the path he trod in loneliness;
 And each deep-hid inscription could he trace;
 How men have fought and loved and fought again;
 How in lone darkness souls cried out for pain;
 How each green foot of sod from sea to sea
 Was red with blood of men slain wantonly;
 How tears of pity warm as summer rain
 Again and ever washed the stains away.
 Leaving to Love, at last, the victory.
 Above the strife and hate and fever pain,
 The squalid talk and walk of sordid men,
 He saw the vision changeless as the stars
 That shone through temple gates or prison bars,
 Or to the body nailed upon the tree,
 Through each mean action of the life that is,
 The marvel of the Life that yet shall be.

—David Starr Jordan.

CHRISTIAN VALUE - JUDGMENT IN RELATION TO CHRISTIAN UNION

BY PROFESSOR W. J. LHAMON

Eureka College, Eureka, Illinois

IF we are in quest of the ultimate basis of Christian union where is it to be found? Shall we say that any one who maintains a vital attachment to Jesus has a right to full recognition in the church universal or in any body of believers denominated Christian? By a vital attachment to Jesus is meant a constructive, conditioning faith, a faith in Christ that issues in a Christlike life. Shall we concede that any man with such a faith, manifesting such a life, is worthy of a place in the universal Body of Christ? To make that concession is to throw the whole matter of Christian union back onto the individual Christian with his value-judgments relative to Christ and his experience in Christ. The individual Christian becomes the unit of union. Can we make the concession?

Early in the nineteenth century there was an American movement decidedly in this direction. The movement issued in the building up of a strong body of believers now quite generally known as the Disciples of Christ, or the Disciple Church. They demanded as their creedal basis a return to the Petrine confession — "Thou art the Christ, the Son of God." They would have no other confession. In their earliest declarations they affirmed that "the Church of Christ upon earth is essentially, intentionally, and constitutionally one; consisting of all those in every place who profess their faith in Christ, and obedience to Him in all things according to the Scriptures, and that manifest the same in their tempers and conduct, and of none else, as none else can truly and properly be called Christians."

This was a noteworthy attempt to reduce the problem of Christian union to individual experience. It did not involve the denial of the historic creeds, but only a denial of their

effectiveness for union. It was even felt that their major effect had been divisive, and that they could not but function as impedimenta on the advance toward union. This was a legitimate historical inference if the creeds must continue to be presented dogmatically as they were during the middle ages and far down into Protestant times, that is, as essential to salvation. This position of the early Disciples carried them back not only of the historic creeds as dogmas, but also of many a vexed question of ecclesiastical polity; of apostolic succession; of sacramental salvation; of priestly pretense; and of churchly authority. It made them a free people—free to start anew in their quest for union; to build on Christian character and Christian experience; to reconstitute, reconstruct, and restore.

But unfortunately the times were not ripe for a movement so radical and withal so consistent. Cramping legalism, sacramentalism, and creedal dogmatism having been thrown out at the door came back by the window. It was assumed that Christian experience must be judged by "obedience in all things according to the Scriptures." There is where the windows were opened wide for the reintroduction of legal and sacramental and dogmatic tests of Christian values and of Christian standing. Much vastly depends on traditional viewpoints and methods of interpretation. The Disciples of the early and middle years of the nineteenth century held precisely the traditional views of the Bible that Protestantism had inherited from Roman Catholicism. To them it was divinely, verbally, mechanically inspired; final, finished, infallible, and prescriptive. They construed it as "constitution" and "law."

Under these categories legalism and sacramentalism came back to militate against Christian experience. However Christly the Christian might be he must be immersed in water for the remission of his sins and the assurance of salvation. Precedent was heightened into prescription and exhortation into legislation. "The ancient order of things" must be sought, and found, and enforced. A church, for instance, that failed to observe the Lord's supper every Lord's day ceased to be a church of Christ. Beginning, therefore, with a passion for

Christian union the Disciples have ended by adding virtually three denominations to the already over-denominationalized and suffering world. There is a relatively small fragment of them who make a test of fellowship of instrumental music, there being no "chapter and verse" for it. There is a fragment of them, a virtual sect now, which has for its half religious, half political slogan the cry of the "restoration movement." This sect fears "modernism," opposes "progressiveism," and harks back with reiterated emphasis to the dogmatic attitudes of a hundred years ago, attitudes which (as intimated above) were inherited from the Roman Catholic Church.

There are, then, these two movements within the major movement of the Disciples of Christ. The major movement is in the main keeping step with the religious forces, the missionary efforts, and the biblical interpretations of our times. By far the larger per cent of the Disciples of Christ are moving forward along the lines of twentieth century biblical scholarship and scientific modes of thought. In order to be a growing and virile people in a rapidly changing, scientific age they have been under the necessity of abandoning many of the dogmatic and legalistic features of their early leaders.

Scholarship has forced them to the acceptance and use of the Bible for what it really is and not for what medieval tradition says it is. The Old Testament is valid under selective processes for spiritual, ethical, and devotional teachings, but not in any sense for Christian legislation. It could not be. The supposition involves an anachronism. The New Testament can no longer be construed as the "constitution and law" of the New Testament church. It is rather the inspirational norm of Christian living and of organized fellowship. The sacraments are not essential, saving forms imposed without reason by a law-giving God. They are privileges extended by our loving Savior and our gracious Father. Baptism and the holy supper are not sacraments at all in the pagan and Roman Catholic sense of the term. They are dramatized expressions of spiritual attitudes.

Having attained this freedom from cramping legalism in the use of the Bible and from a saving sacramentalism in the

use of the ordinances, especially baptism, the Disciples of Christ have an open road before them for the revaluation of spiritual values. That is, they are ready for spiritual value-judgments in relation to individuals and institutions. Perhaps it would be more nearly correct to say that the representative body of the Disciples of Christ are in process of attainment of the freedom indicated above. To an ardent member of the body of Disciples it is gratifying to reflect that, though they missed the way of Christian union because of lingering features of medievalism in their use of the Bible and of the ordinances, they are in a fair way to retrace their steps, and go back to their original Christological position, their first love, the confession of Jesus, simply and only. And that they are therefore in the way to judge religious values as Jesus judged them. And his judgments were not based on forms of law; nor on sacraments; nor on the observance of sacrificial altar forms; nor on abstruse matters of faith metaphysically construed into saving dogmas; nor on proof-texts selected and coördinated to point in denominational directions.

One reflects with joy that the original Christocentric position of the early Disciples is becoming more and more a challenge and an attraction to the larger and more scholarly movements within the bounds of Protestantism. On every hand there is hunger for Christ, and a thirst for simple, unadorned Christliness. A special and noteworthy movement of the kind in the old world, but not confined to it, is known as Ritschlianism.)

Just here one cannot do better than to present a page from Dr. H. R. Mackintosh's book entitled *Some Aspects of Christian Belief*. He says, "Theologians, like statesmen, have a policy. And Ritschl had his policy like the rest. He meant to give unity and freedom to the Christian mind by drawing it back to the New Testament. Unity and freedom are great things specially worth while in religion, and students of contemporary divinity do not have to be told that at the time (Ritschl died in 1889) they were greatly needed. It will scarcely be argued that unity and freedom, in the usual sense,

are characteristic of the arguments of the Augsburg Confession, the Westminster Confession, or the Thirty-nine Articles. These documents are less expressions of faith than systems of dogma, and we read them with a growing sense that the multiplicity of ideas, the mere number of things proposed for belief, is painful and bewildering. But faith cannot be satisfied with an aggregate of doctrines; it seeks and it contains a single unifying principle. Hence we can understand the relief with which in many quarters men greeted the new simplification of theology—not, however, in the low sense of simplicity, as evisceration and impoverishment, but as deliberate concentration on what really matters. . . . What Ritschl said in effect, if not actually in words, may be put thus: Let us fix it that any man is a Christian who can say, *ex animo*, I believe in God through Jesus Christ. And with this criterion as a touchstone let us go over the traditional system and test the various beliefs by applying it to them in turn. In respect to the thought of God, of sin, of redemption, of Christian perfection, we ought to ask and keep asking, What truth on each point is certified by faith in Jesus? If there be dead matter in the hereditary system, which people only say they believe because they hear it frequently from others, let it be dropped for good and all, and nobody will be a penny the worse. We shall only be the freer to unite in essentials.”

This Ritschlian position turns out to be exactly that of the Disciples of Christ before it became encrusted with legalism and sacramentalism. They too said, “Let us fix it that any man is a Christian who can say, *ex animo*, I believe in God through Jesus Christ.” *Ex animo*, right out of his soul! *His own soul*, that is. And that means the man himself is to be the judge of what is in his soul as related to Christ, and if he says he believes and loves and trusts Christ, his judgment must be respected. The values that he himself attaches to his faith must be allowed to stand. If in his own honest eyes he is not a heretic then he is not a heretic though all the Protestant popes, not to mention the Roman Catholic ones, should declare him excommunicate. “Who art thou that judgest another man’s servant?

To his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up, for God is able to make him stand."

This throwback onto the individual, onto his own value-judgments of his own attitudes toward Christ, sends us looking down a very long theological lane. When the prodigal really goes back to the Father and the Father runs to meet him, and kisses him, what becomes of ecclesiastical authority with its priests and bishops and councils and dogmas and sacraments? Shall we go back to the council at Nicea and inquire whether the Father has made the mistake of receiving and embracing an "Arian heretic"? Or maybe he is a "monothelitic heretic" as pope Honorius was. Or maybe this one whom the Father runs to meet has never heard of the difference between transubstantiation and consubstantiation. Perhaps he could not state the difference between the immaculate conception and the virgin birth.

The Savior's dramatization of the sinner who repents and the Father who forgives may be taken as the primal unit in constructive Christianity. So taken, it at once becomes the essential thing. Therein salvation has its definition. And all else is thrown into some other category than that of the essential. The council, for instance, at Nicea may have been expedient when it was and where it was; its deliveries may have been for the time being expedient; but the mistake was made of heightening them into dogmatic necessities, and the ugly work of branding heretics and of creating sects thus began. The process has been pursued *ad infinitum*, and sects have multiplied accordingly.

In order to union this process must be abandoned. If a vital experience in relation to Christ is the unit of salvation it must be also the unit of union on the simple axiomatic principle that X as a saved person has every right of spiritual and organic association with Y and Z as saved persons. Or, to put it otherwise, a Christian is a Christian, and no Christian is more than a Christian, and Christian with Christian can meet as brother meets with brother. And the test of a Christian, that which constitutes him a Christian, and proclaims him a

Christian in his own judgment as to the vital, redeeming values he finds in Christ.)

Philosophies may come and go. "Our little systems have their day." Rituals and sacraments may help or hinder. Forms of polity, loved by some, banned by others, may be expedient here, inexpedient there. But these ten or ten millions of redeemed men with the love of Christ in their hearts and the work of Christ in their hands are the units of union. Let them get together. If creeds are in their way, let them get together. If priests and bishops and popes are in their way, let them get together. If sacraments are in their way, let them get together. If rituals and politics are in their way, let them get together. Let them get together and thereafter create their own expediencies in the way of teachings — not dogmas; of politics — not papacies; and rituals that are regulative but not mandatory.

A Christian is not one whit more a Christian for being by some change or merit a Presbyterian elder or an Anglican bishop or a pope in Rome or a doctor of divinity in a Baptist college. A diamond is just a diamond, and it becomes no more so by being set in gold.

We have been trying to unite denominations as such. But if the units of union are the men and women of God, conscious of the saving values of Christ and conscious of their values in Christ, let them then unite wherever and whenever they can, even if their denominations should become "disappearing brotherhoods." The kingdom of God would not suffer by the disappearance of some scores of our denominations, but it suffers whenever Christly men and women fall from grace, or lose "the narrow way," or merge into the crowd that goes by, or stand at sword points in sectarian antagonism one to another.)

This appeal to individual Christian experience as the ultimate basis in Christian union acts as an emancipation but it does not act as a cancellation. It emancipates from the various doctrinal formulas and from the assumption of whatever authority lies back of them, but it leaves them stand for whatever they may be worth to any one or all of the myriads of

Christian men and women. It removes the whole realm of doctrine from the realm of dogma, and demands that doctrines shall stand, if they stand at all, simply on their merits; and that they shall be taught, if they are taught at all, simply on their merits. In this way religious truth is at once coördinated with philosophical truth, and with scientific truth, and historical, and psychological, and every other kind of truth. The didactic takes the places of the dogmatic, and that also is a return to the method of Jesus. His method was the teaching method, and his religion is a teaching religion. In his final commission to his disciples He said, "Go teach all nations." Surely it is not possible to save the world by the methods of the dictator; it may be possible to save it by the methods of the teacher.

If we do not find saving experiences in Christ where shall we find them? Who can suggest a step beyond the pathway He has trodden? Who can put a better, sweeter thought about God into any heart that is human, or devise a more brotherly relationship between travelers on life's rough road, or inspire men with a holier hope for this world of time and the timeless world?

The mood of Robert Browning in his closing lines of *Saul* is in keeping, one may trust, with the mood of all the lines above:

"O Saul, it shall be
A face like my face that receives thee; a Man like to me
Thou shalt love and be loved by forever; a hand like this hand,
Shall throw open the gates of new life to thee.
See the Christ stand."

W. J. LHAMON.

A PROTEST AGAINST INTER-COMMUNION

BY REV. B. TALBOT ROGERS, D. D.

Associate Rector Protestant Episcopal Church, Danville, Pa.

THERE have been many proposals looking toward Christian unity.

Many efforts have failed. By his example Jesus Christ taught us to pray for unity.

That method has the advantage of strengthening our desire and recognizing God and his holy Spirit as the source and object of unity. For more than four hundred years emperors and popes tried compulsion in various forms of militarism, politics, and the Inquisition. Even the councils of that period were but thinly veiled methods of reaching agreements that might be enforced.

During the past four hundred years theological and scholarly controversies have been common. They were often carried on under the protection of prince or king and their formulas were sometimes the criterion of patriotism.

With the advent of good will and a common national loyalty approach became easier. The first tendency was concession and compromise. But the danger of that method is that unity may mean denial or loss. Herod and Pilate were made friends on the day they rejected Christ. Compulsion, controversy, and compromise are to be avoided. Divisions multiplied and disasters mark those routes.

Some thirty years ago Professor Woodrow Wilson became a leader in a new method of teaching by round table conferences. American industries have adopted the same method in coördinating departments with increased efficiency. The churches awoke to its value, and missionary conferences became common. Then it was proposed to undertake the age-long, complex problem of Christian unity by this method. This of course

included prayer. And the names of Brent, Gardiner, and Garvie should head the list of the honor roll that made the World Conference at Lausanne; and in the days to come all may give generous recognition of the value of the Malines conversations, and enroll as heroes in the cause of unity Cardinal Mercier and Lord Halifax.

Two principles are written in the code of conference: respect for convictions and loyalty to the organic law of participating communions. Unanimity or at least no one dissenting was the condition on which reports were received at Lausanne. We were amazed and thrilled by the degree of unanimity. We felt the influence of God's holy Spirit. It seemed like the beginning of a new era in church history. We had turned our backs on compulsion and controversy. Conference inspired by devotion would be our watchword. But an issue was raised on the last day: should an open communion and intercommunion be a means toward unity, or is it a culminating goal? Was it prejudice or principle that arose to object to the report? It is only fair to say that the time given for the large field of the sacraments was very limited. Some of them were entirely neglected. The regulations of the churches were ignored. The communion service was given very limited consideration. The agreement as to our Lord's presence was remarkable. But the authority for its offering, the material to be used, and the preparation of communicants were avoided.

Many churches emphasize the regulations in regard to the communion service. Some have incorporated in their organic law the requirements in regard to the ministers, the elements, the particulars as to the manner of the service, and the requirements for communicants approaching the service.

Most Christians, I am inclined to believe, still take seriously St. Paul's warning: "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come, wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord." "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's

Body." Probably at no period of church history have people before been welcomed to communion indiscriminately without regard to the question as to whether they have been baptized or not, without regard to the question as to whether they are in mortal sin and unrepentant; and the larger portion of Christians are members of communions that require special instruction, the special gift of the holy Spirit, and a devotional, penitential, fasting preparation for communion.

Can it be reasonable to think that unity can be advanced by ignoring St. Paul, the constitution and canons, and age-long practice of most of Christendom? Rather it smacks of the methods of red radicals who demand direct action instead of reforms by law and constitutional methods.

Let us not prejudice the unity movement by using these methods. The churches should be left free and unembarrassed to legislate for unity and carry such action with a united following.

B. TALBOT ROGERS.

THE MORNING BREAKS

Beyond the war-clouds and the reddened ways,
I see the promise of the coming days!
I see his sun arise, new charged with grace
Earth's tears to dry and all her woes efface!
Christ lives! Christ loves! Christ rules!
No more shall might,
Though leagued with all the forces of the night,
Ride over right. No more shall wrong
The world's gross agonies prolong.
Who waits his time shall surely see
The triumph of his constancy;—
When without let, or bar, or stay,
The coming of his perfect day
Shall sweep the powers of night away;—
And faith, replumed for nobler flight,
And hope, aglow with radiance bright,
And love, in loveliness bedight,
Shall greet the morning light!

—John Oxenham, in "All's Well!"

A RESTUDY OF CHURCH UNION

BY BISHOP WILLIAM M. BELL, D. D., LL. D.

President of the Foreign Missionary Society of the United Brethren Church,
Harrisburg, Pa.

THE conscience of the Christian public has well nigh reached an agreement as to the desirability of a union between those branches of the Protestant church that are similar in doctrine and polity. Occasionally you will hear a dissent from the proposal, but it is the exception. Even those who, for one reason and another, hold out against a ripening judgment in the affirmative are not as insistent of their views as they were formerly. They seem to be slowly recognizing the power of current popular thought and feel less secure of the grounds of their defense of the present unsatisfactory status. For the Christian conscience to reach the conclusion that the similar bodies of Christians should unite in organic union is a long step toward the consummation.

A genuine conviction that the points of similarity are more numerous than had formerly been supposed, and that the respects in which the churches are similar are of vital importance, while the points of dissimilarity are of small importance, seems to be well nigh universal. So we hear it talked in all circles that the churches ought to get together. The oughtness of any mooted question counts for more than formerly. What was right for our fathers may not be right for us, and all this not because principles vary, but because we have more light for the interpretation of principles, and policies are sometimes placed on a plane with principles. A vast amount of sectarian mist has obscured the heavens so that even God's children have not always seen clearly as to what is fundamental in Christianity and what is non-essential. Let us hope that the day of the clearer vision is at hand. Let us supplicate the holy Spirit to remove from us that which is mere prejudice and quicken us to the Christian essentials.

Associated immediately with the desirability of church union is the question of its utility. Saint Paul said that some things that were lawful were not expedient. Before a merger of kindred church organizations shall be a reality there must be a deep and commanding conviction that by such union the kingdom of God will be set forward in America and throughout the world. There are reasons for believing that a material reduction in the number of the church organizations in this country would be of decided advantage in the evangelization of the world and the increased efficiency of Christianity at home. The people who plead for and justify the present segregations into denominations, tell us that there would be a great danger to individual freedom and initiative in such a concentration of administrative power as a considerable union of the several churches would call into existence. This fear grows from a failure to appreciate the fact that the movement toward democracy, which is a product of Christianity, has progressed to the point where no administrative authority could possibly be guilty of the persecutions and oppressions of the past ages.

Democracy, with its recognition of the rights and essential dignity of every human being, compels every movement toward a centralization of power to modify and govern itself by a supreme passion for, and interest in, the collective welfare. The spread of general intelligence and the growth of the spirit of a true catholicity will forbid automatically the past abuses of ecclesiastical power. The leavening power of Christianity has carried civilization forward to the point where all aggregations of power of every sort are feeling the restraints of the new social conscience. This means that the days of the autocrat are numbered on the earth. This does not mean that there will be no centralization of administrative authority for greater efficiency.

It does mean that henceforth all power shall be Christianized, and therefore humanized and just. There is absolutely no contention between democracy, with its exaltation of individual rights, and liberty, and such centralizations of administrative authority as the adequate handling of the great problems

of Christianity shall require. Democracy makes it imperative that all exercise of authority by those who represent the people shall be immediately responsible to the people and always subject to their recall and approval. Let us, therefore, dismiss the unwarranted fear that the movement for church union will build up a monster Protestant church hierarchy, for it never can be. Even Rome has been compelled to abandon its absolutism in many respects and it will continue to do so.

The humiliating confusion and inefficiency which now hinders the work of our isolated Protestant churches is a matter of deep concern to all thoughtful people. We have as our common objective the Christianization of America and of the world. But here we are, crossing wires in the administration of men and means, until practically no consideration is paid to the plans of one church by another that presumes to operate in the same community. What possible justification can there be for our present lack of coöperation, conference, and agreement in relation to the work of one another and the occupation of unoccupied territory?

These crying evils grow out of the fact that we have so many denominations all anxious to build themselves up, so that we not only have competition, but at times wasteful, unscrupulous, and wicked competition. With fewer and stronger denominations we could execute more ample programs and simplify administrative work. We could conserve the Christian forces and meet the forces of evil with a power that presages victory. As it is Christianity is far from being as influential as the number of her pledged disciples would lead one to expect. She wages a desultory warfare when she ought to be moving with a military precision to the redemption of an unchristianized social order and the evangelization of the non-Christian world. How long! O Lord, how long?

Beyond all question the present divisions of our Protestantism are a factor in deterring strong and virile young men from entering the ministry. They have the feeling that the isolations and competitions of modern church life are such as to make their ministry narrow, circumscribed, and lacking in

influence. They foresee their classification with men of small affairs and devotees at belittling altars. This is one reason why the secretaryships of great interdenominational organizations are commanding the services of men and women of the highest ability and devotion. Our sectarian strife belittles the Christian leadership everywhere and makes possible the triumph of the united forces of evil in many a battle that might end in a glorious victory instead of an ignominious defeat. Numbers alone are not decisive, but numbers of good people badly related to a common and gigantic task must often fail when that failure is a calamity to society.

We Christians must remember in these awful and significant days that we have an allegiance larger and deeper than our own petty sectarian differences can ever sanction. If we place a supreme devotion and love on these petty distinctions, such as church names and the like, we grieve the holy Spirit and make an unquestioned contribution to the delay of Christian consummations. It is clearly a matter of utility that the passion lavished upon the unimportant denominational distinctions should be forgotten in a mighty enthusiasm for the Christian essentials.

We come now to the question as to the practicability of church merger even among denominations of similar doctrine and polity. The answer is yes, if and if and if, and no, if and if and if. In other words, the effort, because of generations of training in the other direction, will severely test the discipleship of this age. It will be found impossible if we are willing to continue to live in the provincialism of our lives rather than in the larger boundaries of providential enlargement and unification.

No, it is not practical if we are to exalt the passing and the evanescent, if we are to make much of church names and traditions, if we are to be fond of official supremacy in small circles, where our programs even when accepted are so sorrowfully inadequate to the world's need, and in constant violation of any true statesmanship for the kingdom of God. No, it cannot be if we are to consult our fears and be tenacious of factional slogans. No, it cannot be realized if we are to hark

back to our human founders and clothe them with a sectarian zeal that they would repudiate if they could speak to us now out of the heavenly realities and the full liberations of redemptive love. It cannot be if we remain unacquainted with one another and persist in our bigotry and isolation, if we exalt our divisive zeal to the plane of a cardinal virtue and cry great is our sect and greatly to be praised in all the earth.

Church union is practicable if we keep our eyes on Jesus the Lord, if we seek the baptism by the holy Spirit and fire, if we shall be willing in the day of his uniting power, if we reckon on the divine wisdom to show the way out of all our perplexities, if we believe it is more important that the Christian resources of this age should be aligned in the light of current need rather than consumed in the task of maintaining parallel denominational organizations and machinery under the lash of denominational necessity, even though all the denominations already have facilities that could serve much larger numbers than are now served by them.

Church union will be realized if we care to accept the reasonable presumption that God is as likely to be speaking in a majority action as in an unduly persistent minority action; if we recall that what is sometimes exalted to a worthy fidelity is only a stupid obstinacy, and that this is all the more probable when we are at war with the judgment of godly and devoted fellow Christians who are as likely as we are to hear the voice and know the will of God. If we find ourselves in the minority as to church merger in the body with which we may be identified, we shall make union practicable by acquiescing in the duly expressed wishes of the majority, since in all matters where no vital principle is at stake this is the only attitude consistent with the democracy of Christianity. Let us be sure that we do not misname the so-called reason for our resistance to this gracious movement by calling it a principle when it is only a prejudice. All Christians should be in the spirit of prayer touching the right of this matter and not suffer themselves to become the allies of retrogressive conservatism. "Thy kingdome come, thy will be done on earth as in heaven."

WILLIAM M. BELL.

PROBLEMS OF OUR COOPERATIVE WORK

BY REV. MADISON A. HART
Minister of the Christian Church, Danville, Ky.

WHEN we are in the proper mood it is exceedingly interesting to let the mind dwell on what have been called the seven follies of science, namely, the quadrature of the circle, the duplication of the cube, the trisection of the angle, the transmutation of metals, the fixation of mercury, perpetual motion, and the elixir of life. But there is another folly, call it by what name you will, that has fewer legs to stand on than any mentioned in the preceding category. It is the folly of thinking that we can make much real progress in this old world without the aid, advice, and coöperation of other people. An expert in agriculture recently made this startling and gripping statement: "For the farmer it is either peasantry or coöperation." It ought to be quite evident to even a tyro in thinking that economic slavery and uncomfortable poverty are the natural results of rank individualism, while economic freedom and measurable prosperity come through intelligent and persistent coöperation. Whether we think of coöperation in terms of agriculture, statecraft, education, or religion, it cannot logically be considered as a non-essential. It is basic and fundamental in the growing of a crop, the building of a cathedral, the founding of a university, the safeguarding of our liberties, and the ethical, moral, and spiritual redemption of the whole social order. "The greatest need of our time," says John R. Mott, "is prophets of reconciliation." If we substitute coöperation for reconciliation, the implications are just as true fundamental, and far-reaching. Coöperation is the fine art of living and working together—a simple statement to make, but quite difficult to bring to full fruition. There are hidden facts and forces that must be

brought out into the open before a complete understanding of the situation is disclosed. Only a small portion of an iceberg shows above the surface of the water. The major part is submerged. It is equally true in the study of the vexing and perplexing questions that come up for discussion in science, politics, education, and religion.

Perhaps the very best approach we can make, in an intelligent understanding of the problems that confront us in our coöperative life as a religious body, is to study the whole field of religion. Clearer and more penetrating light may thus be thrown upon the whole situation. We can only get a proper perspective by combining the close-up view afforded by the microscope and the far-away information supplied by the telescope.

1. Canon and interpretation

The sixty-six books composing our present Bible are pretty generally accepted as genuine and inspired, but not universally so. Even Martin Luther spoke of the book of James as "an epistle of straw." The canonicity of James was settled by the Council of Carthage A.D. 397, but was denied at the Reformation by Erasmus, Cajetan, and others. But long before such books as James, Jude, 2nd Peter, 2nd and 3rd John, and Revelation were put under fire with respect to a place in the canon, the problem had come up for discussion with reference to the Old Testament. At the end of the second century A.D. the synagogue accepted as canonical the thirty-nine books found in our English Bible. But the Hellenistic Jews had in their canon, in addition to these, such books as Judith, Tobit, 1st and 2nd Maccabees, Baruch, the epistle of Jeremy, Ecclesiasticus, and Wisdom of Solomon. I mention the fact of the canon, (1) because it is still an open question in some minds; (2) because of the question of authority. A "thus saith the Lord" will often be a matter of serious import in settling the question of co-operation.

But when the canon is accepted there is still the problem of evaluating the contents of these books. Here is where we

face the more difficult question of interpretation and exegesis. Are the books of equal merit? Delicate and difficult problems flow out of textual and historical criticism. Arius and Athanasius divided the religious world of their day over homoousian and homoionsian. We may well say of "Psallo" what someone has said of liberty, "O Psallo, how many crimes have been committed in thy name!" *Baptizo* is often a hidden rock in many a religious love feast. Upon this rock many a gallant ecclesiastical ship has received a mortal wound, and all on board temporarily, if not eternally, lost. The Lord's supper was not only a mooted question in the days of Luther and Zwingli, it is the vital question of the hour in the Anglican Church. The inability of the Lausanne Conference to unite in a closing communion service is a tragic example of the false and fictitious barriers raised between Christian people through somebody's error in the interpretation of scripture. The old theories of transubstantiation and consubstantiation are much alive to-day.

2. *Tradition and unbalanced loyalty*

Ellen Glasgow in her very charming book, *The Romantic Commediants*, a portrayal of the life and traditions of the Southland, puts these words into the mouth of one of her interesting characters, Judge Gamaliel Bland Honeywell: "If there is anything wrong with the Episcopal Church or the Democratic party I would rather die without knowing it." Surely it is perfectly obvious that tradition and unbalanced loyalties stand in the way of progress and coöperative effort in social and political life as well as in religion! Properly evaluated traditions and loyalties play a noble part in the life of individuals, races, and nations. But too often the ministry is ignoble rather than noble. We become wedded to fallacies rather than realities, foibles rather than truths. The *status quo* is to be kept, regardless of new discoveries and a fuller revelation of truth. Jesus found the antiquated and dry-as-dust theories and theologies of scribes, Pharisees, and Sadducees the greatest of all hindrances to the progress of the kingdom. Our Master was forward-look-

ing, but not an iconoclast. "I am come not to destroy the law and prophets but to fulfill them."

Whenever adventurous souls propose any changes in the platform of a political party, the generally accepted creed of the church, or a new approach is made in international fellowship, the timid, hesitant, and self-satisfied individuals begin to ask: "What would the Fathers do and say?" A proper respect for the judgment of the "Fathers" is perfectly apropos, but a slavish subservience to them not only precludes all progress but is a practical nullification of the forward-looking position and attitude assumed by these leaders and pioneers of other times. If Washington were alive to-day his statement concerning "entangling alliances," in my humble judgment, would be stretched to include membership in the League of Nations, the Court of International Justice, or any other sane movement looking to peace, order, and good will among the races and nations of the whole world.

We must follow the leadership of Jesus Christ and submit to the lure of God's Spirit in our day as they did in their days. If we are to inculcate the coöperative spirit in our own ranks and promote unity among all the religious bodies of the world, we must avoid the pitfalls of tradition and unbalanced loyalties. It takes insight as well as sight to sail safely between Scylla and Charybdis.

3. *Essentials and non-essentials*

This naturally and normally brings us to our third proposition, namely, essentials and non-essentials. It is not an easy matter to live up to our slogan and watchword — "In faith, unity; in opinion, liberty; in all things, charity." Here is an ideal that we may logically accept as a working proposition. But when we begin to make particular and practical application of this statesmanlike pronouncement, then our real troubles begin. Soon we have on our hand wide differences and multiplication of problems. Things are not always as simple as they seem. To some it may be the essence of simplicity when we declare that "relativity is chiefly a mathematical correction of

old fashioned physical sciences." But to most of us it is just about as clear as mud. It does not help to clarify the situation very much when practical examples like the following are given: "When an ordinary man steps out into the sunlight he thinks of the day as weightless, but relativity tells him that 160 tons of sunlight fall upon the earth every day. When he steps out into the night and looks up at what he thinks is the pole star, then relativity tells him that he sees the pole star of forty-five years ago." Even with these graphic illustrations I am quite sure we are left in just about as nebulous a state of mind with regard to relativity as we are in when we try to differentiate the essentials and non-essentials of religions in general and Christianity in particular. Bishop Brent calls "sectarianism the cult of the incomplete." And yet each religious body feels that it has something to contribute to the scheme of things when religiously considered. But "confusion worse confounded" certainly exists in religious circles all over the world, because the various religious bodies have not been able to arrive at a common denominator in things ecclesiastical. Up to the present moment we have not arrived at an ultimate protestantism, let alone an ultimate catholicism. The irreducible minimum for the Greek Church does not coincide with the Roman Catholic position. The Roman Catholic creed is leagues removed from the Protestant faith. When we come to consider the more than two hundred churches of Protestantism who is so rash as to affirm that we have arrived at a gentleman's agreement, not to mention unanimity of opinion! Come a bit closer home. Can we claim that we have solved the problem of essentials and non-essentials when the facts disclose our subdivision policy! What have we to say about our disagreements and divisions over instrumental music and missionary societies, to say nothing of other questions in the offing? The Church of Christ and the Christian Church connote different things. Now the cleavage is becoming more pronounced over the position assumed by the strict constructionists and the broad constructionists. There is no need to play the role of the ostrich and say these things do not exist. Perhaps the first step in the solution of our own

problems on a coöperative basis is to frankly admit the difficulties in the way. Up to date we cannot claim to have actually solved the difficult problem of rightly differentiating the essentials and non-essentials. Frederick W. Norwood tells us that he came out of the war stripped of denominationalism and sacramentarianism. "Yes, I came out of the war stripped of nearly everything—but with Christ." Is our way made clear? Is the acceptance of the sonship, lordship, and leadership of Jesus Christ, without definition and explanation, to be the irreducible minimum of Christianity? If so, we have a long way to travel before our dream is realized.

4. *Organization and crystallization*

Jesus Christ left Christianity in a fluid state. He wrote no book, He left great ideas, ideals, and principles engraven on the mind and heart of a few loyal and devoted followers. The church only existed in prophesy; Pentecost made it a reality. In fact it was the "beloved community," rather than a hard and fast organization. But the tendency of the human mind, especially the mathematical and logical mind, is to put ideas into creeds and formal organizations. We are not satisfied with models; we must have molds. But truth of any sort is a living, vital thing. It cannot be expressed in creedal statements and hard and fast organizations. The Nicene Creed and the Westminster Confession of Faith cannot be accepted as final or authoritative. But it is difficult to break away from creeds that have become crystallized and organizations that have become great in numbers and powerful in influence. One of the greatest obstacles in the way of unity and coöperation is the machinery of the church. It is impossible to do without organizations and creeds; but it is difficult to keep them from crushing the life out of the Christian religion. The words of Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, one of the leading ministers of the Methodist Church in New York City, are apropos just here: "I should like to see a commission of leaders of each of our denominations sit down separately and draw up a list of the unique contributions which they believe their communion makes to the religious program of

the Church of Christ. Then I should like to see those lists laid side by side in order that we might reveal to ourselves how many of our so-called differences or reasons for separate existence would cancel out. Thus we would discover that it is not so much doctrinal emphasis but denominational machines which keep us apart." "Bismarck," says Emil Ludwig, "could not live side by side with anyone possessing equal rights with himself—not even with his brother." Perhaps this holds true for organizations as well as individuals! When powerful and dominating personalities get control of large and efficient organizations and truth becomes crystallized in creeds and theological legerdemain, the *status quo* prevails and progress ceases. Until we can restore Christianity to its simple fluid state, we cannot hope for the sort of coöperation and unification that we dream of in our most sanguine and spiritual moods.

5. *Conservative and progressive spirit*

Collinwood in his life of John Ruskin declares that "while Ruskin was morally conservative he was intellectually radical. His instincts clung to the past while his intelligence kept him ahead of his time." We not only find this conflict in our own souls, this eternal warfare between the conservative and radical elements of our nature, but the same conditions prevail in all the relationships of life — individual, collective, and corporate. This never ending battle between these opposing forces is not only found in the realm of religion. It is just as surely a part of our economic, educational, political, and social life. Perhaps in the economy of God this is the only way to keep a well-balanced attitude toward life. In the main we arrive at our best judgments through the trial and error method. Ben Johnson once facetiously declared that we need to combine the oldest of the new and the newest of the old in order to secure the largest increment of truth and reality. This is only another way of saying that a well-balanced life is in large measure a happy synthesis of the thoughts, judgments, and contributions of both the conservative and progressive mind. Progress is never in a straight line. Even in the same school of thought

there are wide divergencies of opinion. Wiggam says that heredity plays the major role in human development; while Dorsey is just as positive that environment is of supreme importance. In my humble judgment God, time, and common sense may be relied upon to satisfactorily settle a great many problems where specialists disagree and where their impotence is made quite apparent. It is said that Harriman died of "too much thinking in bed." There is no immediate danger that an early demise will come to most of us through too much thinking in bed or out of it. But we are in grave danger of shortening our lives through petulance and an over-plus of fear and worry. We may be able to find some comfort and satisfaction from the experience of Will Durant, author of that illuminating and gripping book *The Story of Philosophy*. In his more recent book, *Transition*, which is in reality the mental autobiography of this versatile genius in the realm of ideas and letters, we are forced to the conclusion that often "the darkest hour is just before the dawn," and in the language of Keats: "There is a budding morrow in midnight." The victory gained in his life through a long, hard struggle is graphically stated in these words:

In the inexhaustible activity of the atom, in the endless resourcefulness of plants, in the teeming fertility of animals, in the hunger and movements of infants, in the laughter and play of children, in the love and devotion of youth, in the restless ambition of fathers and the lifelong sacrifice of mothers, in the undiscourageable researches of scientists and the sufferings of genius, in the crucifixion of prophets and the martyrdom of saints—in all things I saw the passion of life for growth and greatness, the drama of everlasting creation. I came to think of myself not as a dance and a chaos of molecules but as a brief and minute portion of that majestic process, burning with the impulse to create, to capture truth and fashion beauty, and to leave behind me something better than myself. I became almost reconciled to mortality, knowing that my spirit would survive me enshrined in a fairer mould than mine and that my little worth would somehow be preserved in the heritage of men. In measure the Great Sadness was lifted from me and where I had seen omnipresent death I saw now everywhere about me the pageant and triumph of life.

There is no royal road to mathematics or to life. We must struggle for the heights and endure many of the disappoint-

ments and hardships of Sisyphus and Tantalus. Paul states the case for both conservative and progressive: "For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now."

Conclusion

When we face all the facts, evaluate all the differences, take human nature at its face value, and consider the matter solely from the human point of view, there is no complete and adequate solution for all our problems — immediate or remote. It is here we must secure inspiration, comfort, and assurance from the fact that "with God all things are possible." Instead of focusing our attention upon the human side of the equation, we must focus it upon the divine side. The recent debacle in China is compelling all religious bodies to re-study the missionary program in Orient and Occident. It is perfectly apparent that denominationalism is thrown out of gear. The impotency of division and competition in religious matters is made more apparent. Maybe the church's extremity will be God's opportunity. What seems now to be a calamity may turn out to be an incomparable blessing. Instead of applauding the crotchets that divide us, we may begin to emphasize the truths that unite us. We may be able at least to go as far as the Roman Catholic priest who, being forbidden by ecclesiastical ruling from making a gift to the new Methodist Church being built in the community, made his contribution after this fashion: "Enclosed please find check for \$100 to be used in tearing down the old Methodist Church." The recent encyclical of the pope does not give us much hope that there is to be any immediate change in the program of the Vatican, either from the point of view of coöperation, federation, or union, except by a full and complete acceptance of all the implications of Roman Catholicism. Mohammed is not yet ready to go to the mountain. Neither is the mountain quite ready to make obeisance to Mohammed. The case is not quite so hopeless when we consider the question as related to the other religious bodies of Christendom. The Stock-

holm Conference on Life and Work and the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order point the way to a better day.

But whether we consider the problem of coöperation in the large, as related to all the religious bodies of the world; or in the small in our own particular fellowship, we cannot escape the conclusion that the goal has not been reached, that the difficulties in the way are legion. Some of the obstacles in the way of this larger and happier fellowship I have briefly sketched in this thesis. Not a complete diagnosis by any means, rather symptomatic of the condition. We must wait upon a broader culture, a more tolerant and brotherly spirit, a more intelligent and universal acceptance of the implications of the High Priestly Prayer of Jesus for the full and complete realization of our highest and holiest dreams and aspirations in the realm of coöperative endeavor among the present divided and bewildered forces of Christendom. In the language of Goethe, "One who thoughtfully ponders the centuries and sways the whole in the clear light of the spirit. All that is petty has vanished from the sight. Oceans and continents alone are of account."

MADISON A. HART.

A CALL TO PATRIOTS

In days long gone God spake unto our sires:

"Courage! Launch out! A new world build for me!"

Then to the deep they set their ships, and sailed

And came to land, and prayed that here might be

A realm from pride and despotism free,

A place of peace, the home of liberty.

Lo, in these days, to all good men and true

God speaks again: "Launch out upon the deep

And win for me a world of righteousness!"

Can we, free men, at such an hour still sleep?

O God of Freedom, stir us in our night

That we set forth, for justice, truth, and right!

Thomas Curtis Clark.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

The Pastoral Letter of the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church

Dear Brethren of the Clergy and Laity:

IN sending you at the close of General Convention our message of pastoral interest, warning, and encouragement, we desire especially to emphasize certain responsibilities which, growing out of the very nature of the church itself, rest as obligations upon us all.

The Christian Church is a society to which has been entrusted the preservation and propagation of the gospel and through which normally men find salvation in union with God. But it is more than that. The church is the Body of Christ and Christ is the representative of all humanity. The church, his Body, is indeed and ought to be in fact the prophecy of human destiny. It foreshadows the right relations of men to God and one another. When we speak of it as the family of God we can rightly do so only in this prophetic sense. It is the inner group of the great family of all mankind, the group which is conscious of the sonship that belongs to all. Its function is not to draw men out from the human family but to make that family conscious of its real relation to God. The kingdom for which the church works and prays comes when men live like brothers in loving obedience to their heavenly Father.

Civilization depends upon control of those divisive forces which prevent a family life. Progress as the Christian sees it is the overcoming of these same divisive forces by the power of God. Unity is its goal. Love, brotherhood, fellowship are only varying names for the spiritual means and motives by which men reach this goal. The kingdom of God is the society in which the divisive forces are overcome and the goal is reached.

THE NECESSITY OF UNITY

If the unity of society is the goal of man's striving, it is obvious that for the church which foreshadows that goal and has to lead society to it, unity is no subsidiary or chance ideal. It is essential. If the kingdom of God is to come among men

the unity of the church must be won. The forces which by setting men against one another continually threaten society obviously cannot be conquered by a church which has not conquered them itself. A divided church implies a yet unconquered world — yes, admits it, accepts it.

In playing our part then as loyal Christians and church people in the great and moving drama of life, we cannot escape the call to unity. One family of God, one world, one church! By example, by service, by prayer, we must seek unity.

We must begin with our own church. No communion in Christendom has in respect to unity a more complex task than ours. Catholic in our unbroken continuity with the Christian ages and in the fulness of our Christian heritage, Protestant in our participation in the great sixteenth century movement of reformation and freedom, we have in the good providence of God succeeded during four hundred years in holding together in some fashion those two fundamental types of religious experience and expression. But the extremes are far apart and often seem impossible to reconcile. The tension is at times severe.

Here in America, as throughout our whole communion, there is to-day a sense of strain. One group seeks a fuller measure of what it counts Catholic. Another group is sick at heart lest some of those great values which we gained at the Reformation may be lost. One prays hopefully for reunion with the church of Rome; the other seeks continually closer relations with Protestantism. In all this and much more which on the surface indicate irreconcilable differences we would see rather the working of forces which are alive, the evidence of the church's attempt to meet the continually new conditions of a world which moves forward with terrifying rapidity. We see witnessed the great truth that Christianity is not a narrow, one-sided, carefully codified section of life; but a divine creative force sweeping into human history, seizing upon human souls with immeasurable power, resistless in its grip upon every aspect of life, making partisans as well as statesmen, prophets as well as priests. A church which did not have new movements continually stirring its depth, in which there were no old hearts in despair and no young hearts aflame with indignation or kindled by visions of the city of God, would, we venture to believe, be a dead church.

The divisions among us are not to be mourned over. They are to be conquered. They are not causes for despair. They are

challenges to the width of our vision, the depth of our love, the soberness of our wisdom, and the steadfastness of our loyalty. If Catholic and Protestant cannot find a way to live together and to worship together the one Lord whom both adore, "then is our faith vain. We are yet in our sins."

PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Two practical considerations are important. One concerns especially the clergy. There is little or no excuse for individualistic extremes such as often disturb the peace of the church and its normal life. Let us have prophets, let us have life and initiative, but let us remember that there is a norm of teaching and of worship in the Prayer Book. The ordination vows of the clergy pledge them to loyalty to "the doctrine, discipline, and worship" of this church. These great words are nowhere accurately defined, but for a loyal priest desirous of doing his work honestly, not obscure in meaning! Loyalty does not consist in meticulous obedience to the letter of rubrics and canons. Such obedience may be rendered accompanied by real disloyalty to the spirit of the church. Loyalty means the honest attempt to understand, to enter into and to express in one's ministry that spirit. It means the use of Prayer Book language, and the careful distinction between what is church law or doctrine and what is merely the individual's wish or opinion. It does not forbid reaching out to the best in Christian experience wherever found. It does forbid the submerging of established usage in alien rites. It does not forbid freedom of criticism. It does forbid subversive conduct. Honest loyalty among the clergy breeds confidence and a sense of security among the laity. It is one great contribution to the task of unity.

But the responsibility for unity rests upon laity as well as upon clergy; and for all there is, to use St. Paul's phrase, a "still more excellent way," the old way of love. We have no right to distrust one another. No group of men is trying by insidious propaganda to wreck the church. There is and ought to be the frank effort upon the part of clergy and laity to further truth as they see it. But we are all Christian brothers. We have the same heavenly Father and the same Master Christ. Instead of setting ourselves in opposite camps and labelling ourselves with partisan names we need to worship and work, to study and confer together. Our differences can be overcome not by the victory of one side over another, not by driving out the Catholics or defeating the Protestants, but by the readjust-

ments of the relation of truths and the discovery of new perspectives. We must seek the conscious and intelligent reconciliation of apparently irreconcilable views. Hitherto we have made an insecure reconciliation through our instinctive desire to hold together, but in many parts of the church where in earnest fellowship our *Christian* tasks have been undertaken as *common* tasks, the goal we are seeking has come appreciably nearer. Let us move on and with the guidance of the Spirit of truth making unity secure by clearness of thinking warmed by the power of love, and complete trust in one another.

UNITY THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

Next to our responsibility as Christians for the strengthening and deepening of the unity of our own church lies our responsibility for advancing the unity of the church of Christ throughout the world. Of all the great movements which have stirred men's imagination and captured their allegiance during the last generation, none has gained more rapidly than that of reunion. Thirty years ago men spoke of it as a mere dream. It has become a matter of practical and immediate concern. The Edinburgh Conference in 1910, the Lambeth Appeal of 1920, the Stockholm Conference of 1925, the Lausanne Conference of 1927, the Jerusalem meeting of the International Missionary Council in 1928, all witness the fact that Christians are beginning to understand that a divided church is by the very nature of Christianity an indefensible, yes, an impossible thing. To the extent that division exists Christ is absent. If we tolerate division (again let us say it), "we are yet in our sins."

This is not the place to discuss in detail the various problems which must be met and overcome in the difficult search for unity. But three principles should be borne constantly in mind by every loyal churchman. The first is that every baptized Christian belongs to the Catholic Church. Whatever his ecclesiastical name, he belongs to the great company of the elect; he knows something of the love of God in the Person of Jesus Christ. Saintship is the monopoly of no communion. The unnamed saints of some obscure group of Christians may know as much of God as those whose names adorn our calendars. Such a truth must drive from our hearts arrogance and exclusiveness. It must make us hospitable to all truth, charitable, of comprehensive thought, with a vision of the Catholic Church big enough to include the full range of Christian life and

experience. Where Christ dwells there must we be content to be found.

But as we move toward unity in this spirit of Christian love we must move in practical ways. And we must move! We cannot wait for a day when through some miraculous divine intervention unity will drop upon us like a New Jerusalem from the heavens. We must seek for unity where the response is likely. In some directions the doors are for the present closed. But others are open. We must try those doors. We must be ready to go forward, to do something. We must dare to be misunderstood. We have heard it said that in America the Episcopal Church has led in the movement toward unity until now other Christians are ready to go forward, but that facing such a practical possibility the Episcopal Church holds back. That must not be.

But that brings us to our last point in reference to church unity. No work of the leaders can bring unity without the coöperation of the people. Although unity cannot come without the careful scholarship of theologians and the wise statesmanship of responsible officials, neither can it come without the warm and vital interest, the loyal prayers, the sacrificial purpose of the rank and file of Christian people. Our Lord Jesus Christ summons us to unity. We must obey the summons.

The summons to unity is no less clear when we look out upon our task in the world. The mission of the church, as we have already said, is the discovery to men of their relation of sonship to God and therefore of the unity which must be achieved if that sonship is to be made a living thing. The forces which divide men, selfishness, greed, lust, must be overcome by the power of God's love in Jesus Christ. The kingdom of God is come when human society has achieved its unity in Christ.

This mission is no mere voluntarily chosen policy. It is the very life of the church. The Body of Christ has no other mission than to make all men part of Christ. Whether the church works in New York or in Hankow; whether it preaches social justice or teaches little children, its aim is the same. Whether it concerns itself with the great problem of peace among the nations or the lesser problem of peace in a New England mill strike, or in the intricate personal problem of peace in a quarreling family, its aim is the same. The love of God in Christ must bring unity. Divisive forces must be overcome.

WAR AGAINST WAR

The most momentous task which faces the world of to-day is the warfare against war. Again and again, the voices of prophets and statesmen have been raised to tell us that if war is not destroyed Christian civilization must be. That we believe is exaggeration. Christ is too strongly intrenched in human society to be conquered by war, no matter how world-wide. God's purposes are too stable to be made mock of in the end by man's ignorance and wickedness. But war is destructive of what Christ stands for. War is degrading, brutal, bestial, like the devil, the father of lies and hatred. It assaults all that dignifies and beautifies human life. It violates the sanctities of the soul. It hurls defiance at the Christian faith that men are the family of God. It challenges the church of Christ to action.

Now it is not the business of the Christian Church to control governments. It cannot lay down in detail these plans and projects which it is the business of governments to formulate and carry out. But it is the business of the church to speak in no uncertain way concerning the Christian view of life and the relations of men and nations to one another. It is its business to guide the Christian conscience in its approach to all such matters. It cannot therefore look on indifferently at war or what makes for war. It must put moral force behind the efforts for peace and a law governed world. Christ summons us to world unity as He does to church unity. Such efforts we would have you see is but part of the great mission of the church.

THE CHURCH'S PROGRAM

In contrast with the vast reaches of the task of ending war or of restoring the unity of Christ's church our own church's mission as expressed in what we call its program seems small. It is as measured in numbers, be they of persons or of dollars. It is not if measured in eternal values. It is the same task of bringing unity in God's great family.

The money which we contribute for carrying out the church's program in nation, diocese, and parish is our part in that task. The missionary whom we thus send out is preaching everywhere as he preaches the gospel, the message of the unity of men in God. The teacher in the parish school at home is helping the children of the church to grow up in full knowledge of what their sonship really means. The social service worker is revealing the unity as well as the dignity of human life. The

evangelist on the city streets is stirring the sleeping sense of kinship which lies hidden in all men's souls.

Varied messages and varied efforts they are which through support of its program we make possible for the church, but all are guided by the same great ideal. All spring from the love of God which we his children know in Jesus Christ. All aim to transform this world of hating, covetous, warring men, dishonoring in their strife the heavenly Father; all aim, we say, to put love for hate, peace and law for strife and chaos. All would create out of this bitter competitive struggle the coöperative life of the family of God.

These efforts are our efforts, dear brethren of the clergy and laity. This is all our task. In private life and public life, in the support of the church's program and in our influence upon the wider life of Christian people throughout the world, Christ calls us to release the power of love that men may be gathered into the unity of the sons of God. Only thus can God have his way among us. Only thus can He answer our daily prayer, "Thy kingdom come." Only thus can the Christ who died for us "see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied."

The Immediate Obligation Toward Christian Unity

WE must increasingly cultivate the spirit of good will toward other communions. Bishop Brent uttered a noble sentiment at Lausanne, "I am just as much afraid of my own ignorance and prejudice as I am of the other man's." It will mark a new era for Christendom when we all reach that point; for ignorance and prejudice are at the bottom of much of our criticism. No communion has a monopoly of truth or goodness. How much we have to learn from one another! I said something like that in an address, and a man came to me afterwards and said, "*You* may not have all the truth, but I *have*." "You have?" I asked. "Yes," he replied, "I have Jesus, who is *the* truth, and when I have Him I have all the truth there is." "But do you fully comprehend Jesus?" I continued. "The length and breadth and depth and height of his great personality and message? Do you know all that? Paul said in his old age, 'I have not apprehended, but I press on,' and wherever Paul is tonight we know that his great heart is still hungry to know more of Christ and 'the power of his resurrection.'" But this man had it all. How much nobler was the attitude of Alex

Whyte in his opening prayer at the Edinburgh missionary conference in 1910. In his imagination he swept the whole field of Christian history, from the Apostle Paul to Phillips Brooks. Everywhere he found illustrious saints of God. He thanked God for the eastern church and for the western church, for Anglican and Nonconformist; for the saints of the early dawn, of the cloistered middle ages, and of the modern home. He saw, as in a moving picture, this procession of mighty souls whom the conquering Lord has led behind his chariot wheels and used for the conversion and spiritual education of the race. As we listened, our narrow denominationalism was rebuked; and we had again the vision of Paul when he said, "All things are yours, whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours, and ye are Christ's and Christ is God's."

It would be a distinct gain if we could take our eyes off the "New Testament church" and fix them upon the New Testament Christ. We talk about "restoring the New Testament church." What do we mean by that? Certainly there has never existed a model church that is to be restored; if so, what church? Not Jerusalem, Judaistic, communistic, practically anti-missionary. Nor Corinth, nor Antioch, nor Ephesus. In all these churches, in the very nature of things, we are dealing with immaturity. What we do have in the New Testament is the ideal of the church, an ideal never yet realized. Our goal is not behind us, it is still ahead.

Three things characterize this ideal New Testament church:

First, unity. The New Testament knows but one church, one body, of which Christ is the head; one temple, of which He is the chief corner stone.

Second, diversity. "Many gifts, but one spirit"; varieties of operations, but one Lord; different workings, but one God, who worketh in all. Unity does not mean uniformity, either in doctrine or ordinance. In the united church each communion will continue to use those forms of worship which are familiar and dear to it.

Third, spirituality. "God is Spirit, and they who worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." The marks of the New Testament church are not external marks, but the "fruit of the Spirit." "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his." To be a Christian is to be Christlike. As Stanley Jones says, "If those who have not the Spirit of Christ

are none of his, no matter what outward symbols they possess, then conversely those who have the Spirit of Christ are his, no matter what outward symbols they may lack." The thing to restore, then, is the leadership of Jesus. He and not the church is the unifying force. Ask any congregation what they believe, and you get a chorus of conflicting opinions; ask whom they believe, and all make the same reply. The *what* is divisive, the *whom* is unifying. In fixing our eye upon the church there is always the danger of a misplaced emphasis, which mars something of the beauty and power of Christ. It would seem that we mortals have only so much emphasis at our disposal; and if we put it all at one point, other values, perhaps more important, are sure to be slighted. The real danger of undue emphasis, for instance, upon an ordinance is that the faith of the candidate shall rest in some outward act, rather than in the changed life which alone has any weight in the sight of God. When we have restored the leadership of Jesus we shall be well on our way to the goal of Christian unity.

We must begin now to develop the Christian unity mind instead of the denominational mind. This is not going to be easy. We have been brought up in the denominational atmosphere; it colors all our thinking; and yet, if ever we are to have Christian union, we must get rid of the denominational mind, for it stands directly athwart the progress of the kingdom of Christ. Out in California a few years ago, a new settlement began to spring up; and like all things in California it grew rapidly. Soon they needed a school, and the community built one. When they wanted a library, everybody got behind the enterprise. Then they said, "Now let us build one church and worship God together," and this they did. But one day came a man with the denominational mind, who discovered that there were in that church nineteen families of his particular denomination. Of course, that would never do; so, by dint of methods known to such men, he succeeded in pulling out those nineteen families and starting a little rival church. Now we will not call that anti-Christian, for no doubt he was sincere; but certainly we will agree that it was unchristian, for he severed the body of Christ and wounded the heart of Christ, simply to satisfy his denominational mind. By no stretch of the imagination can we think of Jesus doing such a thing. As conditions are now, we must, of course, work through our several communions, and it is right and proper that we shall be loyal to them. But this is my thought: we are each to think of his own church as a

means, not as an end; for high over every communion is something greater than any one of them, the kingdom of Christ, the sum of them all. You love your native state, but you love more the union of all the states. Thus there is a lower loyalty and a higher loyalty. When any denomination is conceived of as an end in itself, it thereby becomes a menace to Christendom; for seeking denominational prowess is not the same thing as "seeking first the kingdom of God."

So deep-seated, so ineradicable is the sectarian spirit that many quail before it and regard unity as an iridescent dream. But unrecognized forces are working for unity. One of these is youth. At Lausanne we had only seven women delegates, but one of them was Margaret Slattery. She isn't bigger than a minute, but she is all courage. In one of the group meetings she said one day, "This is the first time I have spoken in this conference, and it will probably be the last. I want to tell you that the thing which is holding unity back is you bishops, and archbishops, and metropolitans, and presidents, and secretaries—you men who hold the jobs. Now, my work is with young people, between fifteen and thirty years of age, and I tell you they are for this thing; they want it, and they want it now; and if you men continue to keep it from them, one of two things will happen: either they will take it out of your hands and bring it about in their own way, or you will have no young people in your churches." And she is right; our youth are not going to take over the devastating bigotries and wasting intolerance of the past. But many broad-minded, far-seeing officials do not deserve Miss Slattery's condemnation. Dr. Arthur Brown, of the Presbyterian foreign mission board, said at Lausanne, "I am willing to see Presbyterianism decrease, yea, even disappear, if thereby unity may be attained."

I am often asked the difference between unity and union. In my thinking, this is the difference: unity is the invisible spirit, union the visible body. To talk about union now, and programs of union, is beginning at the wrong end of the problem. If we had union now it wouldn't last an hour, because we have not the spirit of unity. First develop the spirit, and it will form its own body; but what that body will be it doth not yet appear.

The greatest foe we have to face is complacency, indifference, inertia. After an address in Illinois, a good sister came to me and said, "I believe in Christian union. I suppose I have to, for our people have always preached it; but"—and then

she swallowed hard, "I hope it doesn't come in my day!" I wish all Christians could have heard the missionaries at Lausanne pleading for unity. They came up from the four corners of the earth; they were of different colors and represented different communions; but they spoke with one voice, and it was a passionate appeal for unity. "To you of the western world," they said, "unity is a luxury, a thing you play with; but to us on the mission field it is a burning necessity; we cannot get any further without it." A little boy climbed upon his father's knee and, putting his arms around his neck, exclaimed, "Daddy, I love you!" And the father said, "Well, what of it?" "But daddy, I love you so much that I want to do something about it." If we are going to have any great part in solving the problem of unity, we must begin to do something about it, something more than we have been doing. "Why call ye me Lord, and do not the thing that I command you?"

[From Dr. James M. Philputt in *The Christian*, Kansas City, Mo.]

Protestant Church Women Looking Toward Unity

A UNIQUE and unprecedented meeting was held recently in Buffalo, New York. Though fewer than fifty women were in attendance, they were delegated representatives coming together to consummate plans for a federation of the Protestant church women of America.

There are needs to be met in every community which no denomination can accomplish alone. The women of all the churches in any city or community working together may become an irresistible force for righteousness.

There are conditions and issues in the life of America to-day which are of vital concern to Christian people. No single communion can meet them alone. United influence, voice and service are indispensable. The women of the churches through a united program of education and activities can immeasurably strengthen the power of the church in the life of the nation.

The church, through a concerted and systematic program of education for international and interracial understanding and good will, has exerted tremendous influence toward world peace. Church women, coöperating interdenominationally, can make this educational program increasingly effective in every city and community.

There are also international trends, problems, and relationships which must be understood if the missionary enterprise is to prosper in non-Christian lands. A unified and adequate program of education along these lines is needed everywhere. No communion alone can assume this task. Through the united influence which this new National Commission of Protestant Church Women will make possible, church women will be prepared to render an immeasurable service to all the churches of a given city or community and to the national and world-wide missionary program of all communions.

The historic Buffalo meeting in which the new movement was launched had been preceded by three years of conference, planning, and prayer on the part of leaders in both local interdenominational organizations of church women and in the national missionary organizations of women. Delegates present at this meeting represented local city organizations and the two national organizations of church women, namely, the Federation of Women's Boards for Foreign Missions and the Council of Women for Home Missions.

The urge of the new movement is well expressed in a statement from the report of the findings committee of the Buffalo meeting: "Recognizing the enlarging fields of service and the increasing and insistent calls coming to church women, world-wide in their scope, and recognizing the need for an all-inclusive program of education, we believe that a larger coöperation of church women is not only timely but urgently necessary."

In a number of isolated cities the women of Protestant churches had formed local missionary federations, councils, or missionary social unions immediately following the Jubilee of Women's Organized Work for Missions, which was observed in 1911. A few local unions had appeared before that time. Hundreds of such organizations have been launched in the last few years. The Federation of Woman's Boards for Foreign Missions and the Council of Women for Home Missions fostered these local organizations and gave them missionary objectives.

The World Day of Prayer, observed annually in February, and the wide use of the united mission study courses in city schools of missions and in summer missionary schools and institutes have brought the church women of many denominations together and have developed the spirit of unity and coöperation.

Most local organizations drew up their own plans of work, adopted the name that seemed to them most appropriate, and proceeded with the kind of program that seemed to them most

important. There has never been the possibility of such local organizations coöperating with one another because no national link existed which could represent the inclusive program demanded.

At last the link has been forged. For the Christian women of America the National Commission of Protestant Church Women will provide a voice, a comradeship in service, a federation of activities, and an interchange of plans and methods.

There is power in numbers. The great host of earnest, capable and determined women of the churches through this united movement will accomplish much in making Christian influence and effort effective wherever the situation demands coöperation among the churches.

A major contribution which this movement can make will be in the field of Christian education. It will undergird and enrich the educational work of the churches and provide a united program for development of public sentiment up to the level of Christian standards throughout America. It is reassuring and gratifying to know that its contemplated program proposes conservation and coöperation in all the work which the churches are promoting rather than the formulation of new and perhaps overlapping lines of service.

In the following list of suggested activities the words "conserving" and "coöperating" seem to be key words:

1. Promoting through local organizations, and generally, all activities and influences for which church women should be responsible where interdenominational coöperation is required.

2. Mobilizing the power of united sentiment, prayer, education, and action on the part of the Christian womanhood of America wherever sacred interests are imperiled.

3. Conserving and coöperating in such missionary, benevolent, social, and educational work as is already being carried by local, interdenominational organizations.

4. Forwarding through all possible agencies the cause of international understanding and world peace.

5. Coöperating with existing agencies in the development of an adequate program of moral and religious education for the youth of America.

6. Coöperating in the development of an adequate program of missionary education for the churches of America and seeking integration of that program with religious education.

7. Coöperating in the work of local federations or councils of churches wherever such work can be advanced through a concentration of women's interest and activity.

8. Undergirding, through education, prayer, and coöperation, the work of the Federation of Woman's Boards of Foreign Missions.

9. Undergirding through education, prayer, and coöperation the work of the Council of Women for Home Missions.

10. Coöperating in surveys and movements, both local and outreaching, for civic betterment and social service.

11. Coöperating in or developing a thoroughgoing program of Americanization wherever there are "strangers within our gates."

12. Coöperating in every effort for better national, state, and local law observance and enforcement.

13. Encouraging the education and mobilizing of the vote of the Christian womanhood of America on vital issues.

14. Promoting Christian unity, fellowship, and coöperation among the churches of America for our common task of perfecting the social order and extending the sovereignty of Christ throughout the earth.

It is estimated that there are approximately twelve million Protestant church women in America who should be brought into coöperation.

There are already some thirteen hundred local councils, federations, or other developing organizations of church women. A minimum estimate of present membership in such would be from five hundred thousand to eight hundred thousand women. They are of the most interested, the most active and responsible women in the churches from which they come.

The commission itself consists of the following members: six representatives from local interdenominational organized groups of church women; six representatives from the Federation of Woman's Boards of Foreign Missions; six representatives from the Council of Women for Home Missions; three representatives at large chosen by the above eighteen members of the commission. Alternates for all of the above representatives are to be provided for by their respective groups.

That the local interdenominational organized groups may have a corporate voice and representation regularly chosen, a chairman for this group was elected at the Buffalo meeting in the person of Mrs. James Ferguson of Kansas City, Missouri. The officers of the National Commission of Protestant Church Women consist of a chairman, Mrs. John Ferguson; a vice-chairman, Mrs. Katherine V. Silverthorne; a general secretary, Mrs. Josephine M. Stearns; a recording secretary, Miss Carrie Kerschner; and a treasurer, Mrs. Richard D. Blair. An administrative committee was constituted by the National Commission, which is composed of the officers together with one representative from the Federation, one from the Council, and one representing the local organizations. Standing committees have been provided as follows: committee on plan of work, finance committee, committee on relationships and publicity committee.

A brief historical sketch has been prepared which will be mailed upon request, for the cost of handling, from the headquarters of the National Commission of Protestant Church Women, 1123 Broadway, New York.

It is proposed to launch the new movement among the local organizations already formed, through a series of state and area meetings. Attendance in these meetings probably will be delegated and will consist of leading women among the city federations and in the work of coöperating communions.

The first Annual Meeting of the National Commission of Protestant Church Women will be held in Boston in June of 1929.

Plans for financing this new movement have not as yet been fully formulated. The voice of coöperating local organizations is needed in determining plans for an operating budget. The initial budget is being provided by women of vision and resources. After the movement is launched and the scope and power of its work realized, there is no doubt that appropriations from local organizations and gifts from those interested in fostering such a movement will be adequate to provide the comparatively small operating budget needed.

[From Mrs. Josephine M. Stearns, in *World Call*, St. Louis, Mo.]

New England Conference on Christian Unity

IN the opinion of the World Conference on Faith and Order at its sessions in Lausanne, Switzerland, August 3-21, 1927, and in the opinion of its continuation committee, it is most desirable that local conferences be held in many centers, under independent auspices, for continuing the studies begun at Lausanne. The object of such discussions is "the clear statement and full consideration of those things in which we (Christians) differ, as well as of those things in which we are at one."

At the request of the continuation committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order, members of the Lausanne Conference and other persons resident in New England met several times to arrange for a New England conference. Invitations were issued to representatives in six states of the Baptist, Congregational, Episcopal, Methodist, Presbyterian, Reformed, Seventh Day Baptist, Unitarian, and Universalist churches, the Society of Friends, the Church of the New Jerusalem and various united, non-denominational and federated bodies. The membership included bishops, clergymen, missionaries, professors, laymen, and women. The conference was called to order at 2:30 P. M. on November 20, 1928, in Trinity Parish House, Boston, By Rev. Edward M. Noyes, D. D., chairman of the program committee.

Rev. Floyd W. Tomkins, Jr., of Philadelphia, delivered the opening address in explanation of the object of the conference. Rev. Frederick A. Wilmot, religious editor of the *Providence Journal*, followed with a stereopticon lecture on the subject "What Happened at Lausanne." In the evening a public meeting was held in Trinity Church. The Rt. Rev. Charles L. Slattery, D.D., conducted the devotions and introduced the speakers of the evening — Rev. Morris H. Turk, D.D., whose subject was "Approaches to Unity," and Rev. James L. Barton, D.D., "Unity in the Mission Field." During the morning of November 21, in accordance with the rules of procedure, the conference was divided into small round table groups, each charged with the study of one of the subjects of the program.

As a part of its own calendar, Trinity Church announced a celebration of the holy communion at 12:10 P. M., which was attended by many members of the conference. During the afternoon two large groups consisting of all members who had been discussing the same subject met simultaneously and drafted each its own report. After discussion and emendation these were unanimously adopted.

Regarding the degree of unity in faith as necessary in a reunited church

I. We affirm that our common experience of God through Christ is the basis of our fellowship as Christians.

II. As Christians we recognize an underlying unity of believers in Jesus Christ.

III. We value the historic confessions of Christianity as witnessing to the realities implicit in Christian experience and faith.

IV. In the divisions of the Christian Church we see the zeal of our forbears as well as the divergencies in race and temperament which are part of our historical heritage; but here in America with its fusing of race and tradition we believe Christianity has a rare opportunity to fulfil our Master's prayer that we should all be one.

Regarding a valid ministry for a reunited church

We are impressed by the fact that there is not to-day a ministry recognized by the whole Christian Church nor can there be in a divided church.

The practical question before us, therefore, is not whether one ministry is valid and another invalid, since all our ministries share the limitations of the part of the church universal in which they are exercised.

Each step toward the union of existing churches must be accompanied by a step toward a ministry recognized and accepted by the churches uniting.

At present the difficulties in attaining this end are most evident as between episcopal and non-episcopal churches.

We recommend that steps be taken toward making the ministries of the several churches effectively valid for all.

1. Within non-episcopal bodies we suggest that, in the ordination of a minister, the ministers of all the Christian churches of the vicinity be invited to attend and participate, and that, so far as possible, the minister thus ordained be recognized as an accepted minister by all the churches.

2. As between episcopal and non-episcopal bodies we commend for serious study the plan of union contemplated by the churches of South India, according to which full mutual recognition of existing ministries is accorded, with the understanding that after the union the common action of the United Church in ordaining its ministers shall be expressed through episcopal ordination.

At its final session, the conference expressed its thanks to all who had coöperated in the arrangements, and voted to request the program committee to continue its work and to take steps for the promotion of similar conferences in other centers of New England.

[From Ralph W. Brown, secretary, P. O. Box 276, Boston, Mass.]

Baptists Welcome Round Table

AMONG questions of universal and lively interest that have occupied the attention of religious leaders and editors within the past year, one of the most prominent is that of Christian unity. In the Northern Baptist Convention at Detroit, an official invitation was received from the Disciples for a frank round table consideration of the question of fraternal coöperation between the Disciples and the Baptists. Again, the address of President Mullins at the Toronto congress of the Baptist World Alliance treated the subject of Christian unity as a test of Baptist life in the world's life, and the program of the congress developed various phases of the subject in two or three set addresses.

To the credit of the Disciples who at Detroit officially invited Baptists to a round table conference, it is to be said that they made the existing unity, mutually recognized and accepted, the basis for a proposal not to attack either denomination or any denomination, but to seek ways of fraternal understanding and coöperation. The list of particulars, enumerated by the spokesman of the Disciples in extending the invitation, in which the two peoples are so far similar as to constitute a hopeful ground for such conferences, was characterized by fraternal insight, fairness, and winsomeness. That an invitation so extended will be accepted in the same spirit is a matter of course.

[From *The Baptist*, Chicago.]

Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit

THE United Census Bureau recently issued a bulletin announcing that there were twenty-seven churches of the Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit Predestinarian Baptists in this country, listing 304 members. Nine of these with ninety members were located in the state of Kentucky, and thirteen with 145 members were located in the state of Tennessee. Six were located in urban territory and twenty-one in rural areas. Expenditures reported by the twenty-seven churches for current expenses, benevolences, etc., totaled \$473. We have no idea what "Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit" means, but it evidently must be something mightily worth while to the kingdom of God — else why maintain a special denomination to preserve it? But we wonder if, in the face of the present world situation, the rest of our denominational divisions do not seem about as meaningless and as much of a burlesque on the real spirit and purpose of Jesus Christ.

[From *The Herald of Gospel Liberty*, Dayton, O.]

Unity From Within

We must regain a sense of proportion. The use of the new canon for instance — Scriptural and catholic as I believe it to be — is not a vital interest of the kingdom of God. The individual liberty claimed by some, in matters like the reservation of the holy sacrament, is no necessary asset of a true catholicism, still less of the church's spiritual efficiency. The Gospel

will not be less effective if men are obtrusively slow in asserting their own point of view; on the contrary, it will be incomparably more so, for nothing hinders the church's witness in this land more persistently than the widespread notion (however exaggerated) that some of her sons are prepared to take the law into their own hands when it happens to conflict with their own preferences. If ever in the history of the Church of England her sons have been called to sacrifice their own idiosyncrasies for the common good this is the moment.

We hoped indeed that by this time the long task would have been finally accomplished and that we should be ready with glad hearts and untrammelled minds, to set ourselves to the still greater enterprises which Christ's people are called upon to face both at home and abroad. Instead of that we are compelled to turn our attention inwards once more; to scrutinize our own life and worship, to see if as a church there is any way of wickedness in us, any group-blindness, group-selfishness, any readiness to subserve the business of the kingdom of God to party aims or sectional interests.

[From the Bishop of Winchester, in *The Christian World*, London.]

The Appeal Must Be to Christ

IN all our problems of adjustment we are very prone to forget that the final test of any position is not the law or the teaching of the Protestant Episcopal Church. It is rather the truth in Christ Jesus. The appeal to Scripture means the direct appeal to Christ as we find Him in the New Testament, or the indirect appeal to that which growing from Him in the life of the church is congruous and truly expressive of Him. When we say that this or that type of doctrine, let us say, of the eucharist is contrary to the Prayer Book, that does not end the matter. It does establish a presumption. But the question of truth lies back of it. The law of the church may be unmistakable, but the law of the church may be wrong when tested by the truth in Christ. When the bishop of Manchester proposes that our altars should be open to all baptized members of the Catholic Church it may be contrary to the present law in England. I would not count it such in America. But that is one question. It is quite another as to whether such ought to be the law of the church. I am sure that the bishop is right, as I am equally sure that his position in regard to the con-

secration of the eucharist, if reported correctly, is right. We must distinguish between regularity or validity in the sense of regularity, and efficacy as God would see it. It is a strangely inconsistent position which grants to one group of Christians the right to follow conscience to the extent of schism without imperiling their sacraments and deny that right to another. There are and must be losses in spiritual value as the result of every schism, but to say that there are losses is far from saying that Christ is not really present and appropriated.

But to proclaim the supremacy of truth and acknowledge the supremacy of conscience in the apprehension of truth is to bring us back again to the Lausanne position, that conference and not controversy nor yet authority is the way to unity. For that again I plead in our diocese where I am sure the spirit of it does rule, within our own church and in our relations with other communions. Conference presupposes that mutual trust and respect which ought always to characterize Christians. It assumes that each side is eager not to prove its own truth, but to share its understanding of truth. It assumes that the truth may be larger than that glimpse of it which any party to the conference holds. Now it is along that line and only that line that there is any hope for unity. With the infinite variety of human personalities and the consequent variety of reactions toward experience we can never hope to make men think alike. We can never get a regimented unity. That we have already seen. But we can hope that by conference in love and good will we may see truth in its right proportions, get first things first, discover that we can agree upon the relation of all the several divisive doctrines to the Christ himself.

For, after all, when we follow this question of truth to the end we discover that our whole ecclesiastical problem including reunion is to find a church which is really the Body of Christ, not in name, not in profession, not in ideal merely; but in genuine fact, able to manifest to the world the fullness of Christ himself. What kind of a church can do that? If we ask ourselves that question how pitifully we see our failures. Who would dare to claim for his own communion that it contains all the riches of Christ? Who would dare to claim that he has nothing to learn? Rather will he not call in gladly to brotherly conference and confidence every humble follower of the Christ? Will he not say "Come, and let us reason together? Here is what I have to give. This is the treasure I have found. Discover to me yours." And then together they will fashion and re-fashion the vision of the great church which shall manifest all

the abundance of Christ to the world. For the final test in all that the church does is the test of Jesus Christ himself.

It is a terrible, a terrifying test. For a church which really represents Christ would be a vastly different body from any that we know to-day. It must of necessity be a united church, a church of members bound together in love. But it must be more than that. It must be a prophetic church carrying with power the message of Christ to the world. Individual prophets do that to-day; but the church in her corporate life is, I fear, but a faint shadow of the real Christ. Think a moment of Christ in the world to-day and then ask how far the church is revealing Him to men. Would He have no word to say of our frank paganism, of our materialism, of our profit-worshipping, of our acceptance of a social system which is based on jungle ethics? Would He have no word to say of the hideous wickedness of war? Of the monstrous programs for naval aggrandizement which threaten America with disgrace to-day? Of the wicked attempt to rouse ill-feeling with our closest friend among the nations? What would Christ the flaming prophet who bearded the powers of his day in their stronghold, whose burning words drove them like whipped curs away, what would the Christ say of these things? Ask yourself that and then ask what is the voice of his church concerning them. A prophet here and a prophet there; but corporately, just mild and gentle words, faint protests, apologetic suggestions with the implication that the morals of war and industry, the morals of the cult of power, are really safe in the hands of this world. I ask you again, does the church speak as Christ would speak? Such matters seem like a far cry from the question of the unity of the church but I bring them to your minds that they may illustrate in another way the same great principle. It is the business of the church to manifest Christ to the world for the church is the Body of Christ. It must then be the business of the members of the church always to take back to Christ every question which confronts the church, to seek his will, to ask how his will may be revealed to men, and then to use every power that his church may manifest Him fully. It is a hard task; but all life is a hard task. It is a hard task; but it is God's task and He is King of kings and Lord of lords.

[From Rt. Rev. Edward L. Parsons, in his address to his Diocesan Convention, San Francisco.]

BOOK REVIEWS

AFFIRMATIVE RELIGION. By Winfred Ernest Garrison. New York and London: Harper and Brothers; 292 pages; price \$2.00.

Any reader is richly compensated if he withdraws from the rush and hurry of the world to read this book through at a sitting. It may be a morning or evening withdrawal; but, from the first chapter on "Affirmation and Negation" to the last chapter, entitled "The Possible You," he will find himself in a better state of mind to think through some of the problems that come to him in the affairs of every day. It reminds us of the facile pen of Brierley — clear and not afraid to say the thing that ought to be said and say it in such a way as to make one think it is what he has always believed, although, as a matter of fact, it is strong modern thinking about those beliefs and attitudes which have both validity and value.

Not much space is given to what men "used to think," but it is an interpretation of what men are thinking now as to science and religion, authority and experience, and the possibility of passing out of the fixed into the liberty of understanding and doing. All causes have their conformists and nonconformists. Whatever tendency there is to lean upon authority, the attitude which trusts evidence is gradually making its way to a place in the thought of the world. The wrath of the intolerant is not so serious as it used to be.

Dr. Garrison maintains that "belief is wholesome and necessary; good, rugged, whole-hearted belief." There is no place for a non-affirmative faith. But can the ancient creeds supply this? He shows how futile they are and that "unwillingness to investigate for fear of discovering some truth inconsistent with faith" is infidelity. The Christian world insists upon remembering Jesus as a reasonable and sympathetic friend rather than an arbitrary ruler. "To our modern minds a friend is greater than a king, and a teacher is greater than a lawgiver."

The chapter on the "Holy Scriptures" is particularly clear. In discussing the church he dissents from Mr. H. G. Wells, who contends that religion cannot be organized, but Dr. Garrison affirms that there are Christians outside of the church and non-Christians inside. While institutionalism has its drawbacks, a man should be in the church to help bear the burden of promoting Christian ideals. A man who "will not join the church because it is divided into sects is himself a sect of one member."

Sin, salvation, virtue, and grace are treated in terms of personality and companionship. We are "transformed into his likeness by the power of his example and the contagion of his personality." Struggle, health, and

liberty are factors in an affirmative religion. "We are a generation of button-pressers and knob-twirlers; the scientists do the rest." Faith is forever dealing with ultimate values "which lie beyond the reach of demonstration and with enterprises which call for the spirit of divine adventure."

It is significant to find a whole chapter devoted to the necessity of art — and one of the most illuminating chapters at that. There is a place for art in worship, buildings, and conduct, and Dr. Garrison gives an interpretation of this necessity that is very stimulating.

The chapters on "Do We Need a New Religion?" "The Mystical Mind," "The Life Everlasting," and "The Possible You" take us into the very heart of the theme discussed by Dr. Garrison. He insists on a more practical expression of the religion which we already have; he recognizes that "every man is part rationalist and part mystic," and he rightly gives place to the poets as better interpreters of religion than philosophers because "they move in an atmosphere of appreciation and are unembarrassed by questions about proof and demonstration." He finds in God the chief proof of our immortality and that "the possible you" is the hope of the world. It is an understandable presentation of those disputed and obscure problems that must be faced frankly by all who would help in making real the kingdom of God on earth.

CHRISTIANITY, PAST AND PRESENT. By Charles Guignebert, Professor of the History of Christianity, University of Paris. New York: The Macmillan Company; 507 pages; price, \$4.50.

This is one of the most provocative books of recent times. One may dissent from many things both in the premises and conclusions, but no one can read these pages without again thinking through the rise and century-long contentions of Christianity. Dr. Guignebert has a powerful grasp upon history and frequently reminds us of Carlyle. He belongs to the school of liberal thinkers.

He begins with the life of Christ, treating the gospels as having not very much reliable data, being the products of comparatively late editing. Because of the limited hearing which Jesus and his early followers received from the Jews it was necessary that Christianity should be taken to the Gentiles. At this time Paul becomes the interpreter of Christianity, which, however, had taken root among Gentiles before Paul's conversion, but he laid the foundations for its great doctrines of the sacramental church.

With Jewish and oriental religious heritages Christianity took on organization with monarchic bishops and formation of dogma and gradually became a controlling factor in the life of society. He traces the institutional and intellectual developments, giving conspicuous consideration to the history of the papacy and the growth of sacerdotalism.

It is a fascinating exposition of Christianity through the customary periods of history into ancient, medieval, and modern, and in every epoch one is impressed with the author's philosophy of religious history. Pagan influences are emphasized and every influence is recognized so that the church appears to be a kind of synthesis of all the ancient religions at the time of Christianity and through which Christianity has passed in its growth through the centuries.

Roman Catholicism receives a major consideration, especially the struggle of scientific thought against the alarm of the papacy. He severely indicts the Roman Catholic Church and affirms its early decay in consequence of its hostility to liberal thinking. He says, "It may happen that a new religion may one day issue from it, but a life-principle of religious revival may well forth from its ruins, but as far as it is strictly speaking Catholicism, that is, as far as it is one of the definite historic forms of Christianity, the role seems to be virtually at an end in the world." He affirms that "the Master whom liberal Protestants venerate and follow bears scarcely more likeness to the Jesus of history than the Christ of the Catholics." Because there is less tendency to suppress liberal thinking among Protestants than among Catholics, he regards Protestants as having a more hopeful future, but he sees little indication of Protestant unity because of its individualism. Nevertheless he maintains that the Christian idea will survive.

It is a remarkable book and will continue to be read long after other books dealing with this theme have become closed volumes. There is something about it that makes it immensely stimulating. Dr. Guignebert belongs with Loisy and writes with a boldness that challenges the reader. He moves step by step in his thinking and gives the reader a sense of comradeship in an attempt to a great understanding.

WHITHER MANKIND. A Panorama of Modern Civilization. Edited by Charles A. Beard, co-author of *The Rise of American Civilization*. New York and London: Longmans, Green & Co.; 408 pages; price, \$3.00.

It is well for one to look out upon our complex and confused civilization from the eyes of such men as Charles A. Beard, Hu Shih, Hendrik Willem van Loon, Bertrand Russell, Julius Klein, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Howard Lee McBain, Emil Ludwig, C.-E. A. Winslow, Havelock Ellis, George A. Dorsey, James Harvey Robinson, Lewis Mumford, John Dewey, Stuart Chase, Everett Dean Martin, and Carl Van Doren. Dr. Beard writes the introduction and epilogue.

The civilizations of the ancient and medieval times as well as the civilizations of the East and the West are compared. The presentation of civilization as interpreted by science, business, labor, law and government,

war and peace, health, the family, race, religion, the arts, philosophy, play, education and literature is from the pens of some of the most gifted writers of modern times. The names of any of these are sufficient to arrest attention whether it be in the authorship of a new book or an article in the press. People read what these contributors have to say.

Perhaps no civilization has had its values and its destiny so critically assessed as modern civilization. There is a wider diversity of opinion, coming from more angles and more competent to render an opinion, than at any time before in history. The fever of these times is not a passing incident, but "its emotional sources lie deep in the nature of things." Interwoven with the economic conflict is the struggle between Catholics and Protestants, "the former idealizing the middle ages of papal supremacy" and "assailing capitalism, even when forced to yield to its economic exigencies." Self-determination for democracy, which flamed so high after the world war, has accentuated conditions. Considered from any point of view the "anxiety about the values and future of civilization is real."

Dr. Beard and his collaborators have attempted to answer many of the hard questions coming out of these times. This volume is a fine contribution to a symposium on civilization. It is not the mouthpiece of any special economic, racial, religious, or nationalist school. It sets forth great facts and argues that history reveals no golden age in the past. "At any rate destiny seems to point to the future—not to the past." It regards the present day civilization, founded on science and the machine, as more permanent than the older agricultural civilizations of the past.

Each chapter is a development of the special aspect of modern civilization as seen from its particular field. It is positive in its declarations. The sharpness of its lines adds to its interest and challenges every reader to be an explorer for himself into the values of the destiny of modern civilization. It is, therefore, a contribution of great value and helps us to think with clearer understanding through the problems of which all of us are parts.

THE GUIDE FOR THE PERPLEXED. By Moses Maimonides. Translated from the original Arabic text by M. Freidländer, Ph. D. Fourth edition, revised throughout. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.; 414 pages; price, \$3.00.

The popularity in this day of this book by a Jewish scholar of the twelfth century is one of the most remarkable instances of the permanency of scholarship. Maimonides belongs to Spain by birth and early education. At twenty-three years of age he entered upon his remarkable career of authorship. His talmudic knowledge was profound. By him Aristotelian ethics was transplanted into Jewish soil. He maintained that the two systems, the Jews and the Greeks, were equally true. This volume was his third great work, which he completed about 1195. In this he speaks as a

philosopher to the philosophically trained and on it rests his fame in the history of Christian scholasticism to which he gave an important stimulus. In it he boldly rationalized Jewish theology and operated with the Aristotelian philosophy as expounded by the Arab thinker Avicenna. He touches with a master mind the whole field of philosophy and, on questions of attributes, nature, evil, knowledge, temptations, equality, prayer, fear, wisdom, and similar subjects it reads as though he were among some of the first authors of the twentieth century. It is a work of charming interest.

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF ALEXANDER CAMPBELL. By Clarence R. Athearn. St. Louis: The Bethany Press; 204 pages; price, \$2.50.

The work and the spirit of Alexander Campbell have been greatly clouded by the attitude of the denomination of which he was the founder. The Disciples never produced a man like Alexander Campbell, consequently the great ideals for which he stood found expressions from lower levels. This is not unusual in the history of denominations. Mr. Athearn has done a needed service in producing this book — well written, comprehensive, and fair in its interpretations. The varied influences that contributed to the education of Campbell are presented with such evidence of research that it is not surprising to find his great mind rising to significant heights from resourceful backgrounds. It is a good companion volume for Dr. W. E. Garrison's *Alexander Campbell's Theology*. It is beautifully printed and will hold a high place as an interpretative volume in the biography of one of the most attractive personalities in American Christianity.

ARE THERE TOO MANY CHURCHES IN OUR TOWN? A Discussion Outline. New York: The Inquiry, 129 East 52nd St.; 108 pages; price, 75 cents in paper, \$1.25 in cloth.

This is a practical little book dealing with Christian unity as it relates to local issues in a particular community. It takes up the question as to the function of the church, which brings to mind a valuable little book brought out by *The Inquiry* some time ago entitled *Why the Church?* Both of these books might be studied together. A community study or survey should be the basis for discussion, out of which may come the question, is union desirable? If so, what adjustments are necessary? It is a most suggestive line of study, practical questions with a fine list of reference books and articles which may be easily secured for further equipment in a study that the whole church must face and become party to in its adjustments. We heartily commend it for group study.

NEW HORIZONS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. By Frederick C. Grant, S.T.D., Dean of the Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Ill. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co.; 287 pages; price, \$1.50.

These are the Hale lectures for 1927-28. They are eight in number and every one is true to the title of the book. They deal with religion as related to a changing universe, natural sciences, history of religions, psychology of religion, the new Bible, theology and modern philosophy, and the Christian doctrine in the twentieth century. As an epilogue the author names four observations: (1) the primacy of the ethical element in Christianity; (2) an ethical religion with a minimum of philosophical content; (3) Christian doctrine not empirical knowledge; (4) theology existing apart from faith, and therefore independent of theology. Its positions are well taken and clearly thought out. It is a book of real merit.

THE LIVING CHURCH ANNUAL. The Churchman's Year Book and American Church Almanac 1929. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co.; 616 pages; price, \$1.00 in paper.

There is no denominational year book that is more satisfactory than that of the Episcopalians. It abounds in information regarding the Episcopal Church in America and its classifications are simple and practical. We hope the time will come when all the denominational year books will have a large section on interdenominational work and those movements having to do with a united Christendom. This would have been a worth while addition to a work so finely compiled as *The Living Church Annual*. But these things will come later. Since the Episcopalians led so well in the World Conference on Faith and Order, we would like to see them lead in this.

LOVE. By William Lyon Phelps. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.; 46 pages; price, \$1.00.

Dr. Phelps always writes well. His little book on *Happiness* is a gem. This is a companion volume. No one can read it without being helped. He makes love a part of everyday life. As a gift book it would be a commendable choice.

Christian Unity Conference
of the
CHRISTIAN UNITY LEAGUE
at
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

Place: Linwood Christian Church

Time: January 16, 17, 1929

Address each morning, Group Conferences and General Conference each afternoon. Addresses in the evening, closing on the last evening with the celebration of the Lord's Supper, with Dr. B. A. Jenkins presiding and ministers of all Christian communions assisting.

No official delegates, but volunteers from all communions. Every group of Christians within a thousand miles of Kansas City ought to be represented in this Conference. The Program will be announced soon.

For particulars write Peter Ainslie, Ten Hills, Baltimore, Md.

"God gave unto us the Ministry of Reconciliation"

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

CONTENTS**At the Editor's Desk**

The Passing of Bishop Charles H. Brent

Denominational Currents

The Kansas City Conference

Dr. Rogers and Intercommunion Again

Will the Churches Sign a Reconciliation Pact Among Themselves?

The Outlook for Christian Unity **KARL REILAND**The Significance of the Italo-Vatican Concordat for
Christian Unity **FREDERICK LYNCH**Approaches to Unity **MORRIS H. TURK**Progress Toward Religious Unity **HENRY A. ATKINSON**The Nature and Extent of Unity **EDWARD SCRIBNER AMES**Difficulties in the Way of Christian Unity **SAMUEL HARKNESS**Ohio's Christian Unity Program for 1930 **VINTON E. McVICKER**

Findings of the Mid-West Conference on Christian Unity

What People and Papers Are Saying About Unity

Protestantism in Virginia Reveals Debts Owed Both to Catholic and Jew —
 What Earthly Good are the Denominations? — Unity of Methodists and Pres-
 byterians — Shall we Try to Save Denominationalism? — Union of the Evan-
 gelical, Reformed, and United Brethren Churches — Baptists and Disciples
 Consider Union — A New Roman Catholic Move

Book Reviews

Christian Unity — The Catholic Life — Law or War — Christianity and the
 Present Moral Unrest — The Divine Revolution — Boston

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Inc.

W. H. HOOVER, President

230 N. FULTON AVE., BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

AGENTS:

Fleming H. Revell Company, New York

Maruzen Company, Ltd., Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka and Sendai

A Statement

THIS journal is the organ of no party other than those, growing up in all parties, who are interested in the Unity of the Church of Christ. Its pages are free to all indications of Christian Unity and Ventures of Faith. It maintains that, whether so accepted or not, all Christians—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, Protestant, and all others who accept Jesus as Lord and Savior—are parts of the Church of Christ and that their Equality before God is the paramount issue of modern times.

Such a journal must, necessarily, be unofficial in its attempt to be an Interpreter of the mind of the churches and in furnishing a Forum for better understanding and cordial appreciation between the divided, and sometimes far isolated, communions of Christendom. It, thereby, seeks to contribute something to clear the way to the Altar of Reconciliation.

It does not hold itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors, except in a very general way as to their character and general attitude; but it invites to its pages such contributions of thought as will, on one hand, help in the removal of misunderstandings, and, on the other, create an atmosphere where our differences may be frankly faced and freely discussed in Christian Fellowship.

All contributors are allowed the same freedom in the expression of their thoughts, as the Editor exercises for himself. He does not anticipate that others will always approve his thoughts, any more than he presumes to assume responsibility for the thoughts of others; but every writer is responsible for what appears above his own name. We are to be free to think and equally free to let think, until, in corporate thinking and corporate praying, we find the Road to Brotherhood.

Consequently, this journal is not only not the organ of any party in Christendom; but, likewise, it is not the exponent of any theory of Christian Unity. It follows the reality in personal experience of spiritual growth in Christ—growing up in Him and toward other Christians as we find the Truth, which shall free us from suspicion, prejudice, pride, and unlove. Then we shall be able to interpret Christ in those terms which He expressed in His own words,—“By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have Love one to another.”

CONTENTS

APRIL, 1929

VOL. XVIII.

No. 4.

<i>AT THE EDITOR'S DESK.....</i>	275
<i>THE PASSING OF BISHOP CHARLES H. BRENT</i>	275
<i>DENOMINATIONAL CURRENTS.....</i>	275
<i>THE KANSAS CITY CONFERENCE.....</i>	277
<i>DR. ROGERS AND INTERCOMMUNION AGAIN.</i>	279
<i>WILL THE CHURCHES SIGN A RECONCILIATION PACT AMONG THEMSELVES?.....</i>	282
<i>THE OUTLOOK FOR CHRISTIAN</i>	
<i>UNITY.....KARL REILAND</i>	290
<i>THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ITALO-</i>	
<i>VATICAN CONCORDAT FOR</i>	
<i>CHRISTIAN UNITY.....FREDERICK LYNCH</i>	298
<i>APPROACHES TO UNITY.....MORRIS H. TURK</i>	304
<i>PROGRESS TOWARD RELIGIOUS</i>	
<i>UNITY.....HENRY A. ATKINSON</i>	316
<i>THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF</i>	
<i>UNITY.....EDWARD SCRIBNER AMES</i>	324
<i>DIFFICULTIES IN THE WAY OF</i>	
<i>CHRISTIAN UNITY.....SAMUEL HARKNESS</i>	337
<i>OHIO'S CHRISTIAN UNITY PRO-</i>	
<i>GRAM FOR 1930.....VINTON E. MCVICKER</i>	342
<i>FINDINGS OF THE MID-WEST CONFER-</i>	
<i>ENCE ON CHRISTIAN UNITY.....</i>	349
<i>WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING</i>	
<i>ABOUT UNITY.....</i>	354
<i>BOOK REVIEWS.....</i>	366
<i>CONTENTS OF VOLUME XVIII.....</i>	369

'THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

230 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

Entered as second-class matter October 18th, 1923, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., U.S.A., under the Act of Congress of March 3rd, 1879.

The Christian Union Quarterly

EDITOR

PETER AINSLIE, D.D., Minister Christian Temple, Baltimore

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FREDERICK LYNCH, D.D., Educational Secretary Church Peace Union, New York, and BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, JR., D.D., Rector St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, Richmond, Va.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

- | | |
|---|---|
| DR. HAMILCAR ALIVISATOS,
Athens, Greece. | PROF. RUFUS M. JONES,
Haverford, Pa. |
| BISHOP CHARLES P. ANDERSON,
Chicago, Ill. | REV. SAMUEL McCOMB, D.D.,
Dresden, Germany. |
| REV. NEHEMIAH BOYNTON, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. | BISHOP FRANCIS J. McCONNELL,
New York, N. Y. |
| BISHOP CHARLES H. BRENT,
Buffalo, N. Y. | BISHOP WILLIAM F. McDOWELL,
Washington, D.C. |
| DEAN CHARLES R. BROWN,
New Haven, Conn. | REV. WILLIAM P. MERRILL, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. |
| PROF. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN,
New York, N. Y. | DR. WILFRED MONOD,
Paris, France. |
| REV. RAYMOND CALKINS, D.D.,
Cambridge, Mass. | DR. C. C. MORRISON,
Chicago, Ill. |
| BISHOP JAMES CANNON, JR.,
Washington, D. C. | DR. JOHN R. MOTT,
New York, N. Y. |
| PROF. DR. J. EUGENE CHOISY,
Geneva, Switzerland. | BISHOP HARALD OSTENFELD,
Copenhagen, Denmark. |
| REV. S. D. CHOWN, D.D.,
Toronto, Canada. | BISHOP EDWARD L. PARSONS,
San Francisco, Calif. |
| DR. J. A. CRAMER,
Utrecht, Holland. | PROF. ARTHUR S. PEAKE,
Manchester, England. |
| PROF. DR. ADOLF DEISSMANN,
Berlin, Germany. | PRESIDENT GEORGE W. RICHARDS,
Lancaster, Pa. |
| REV. A. W. FORTUNE, D.D.,
Lexington, Kentucky. | PRINCIPAL W. B. SELBIE,
Oxford, England. |
| DEAN H. E. W. FOSBROKE,
New York, N. Y. | PASTOR DR. FRIEDRICH SIEGMUND-
SCHULTZE,
Berlin, Germany. |
| DEAN W. E. GARRISON,
Chicago, Ill. | DR. ROBERT E. SPEER,
New York, N. Y. |
| PRINCIPAL ALFRED E. GARVIE,
London, England. | THE ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA,
Upsala, Sweden. |
| MOST REV. METROPOLITAN GERMANOS,
Thyatira, Asia Minor. | DR. HENRY VAN DYKE,
Princeton, N. J. |
| PRESIDENT W. A. HARPER,
Elon College, N. C. | REV. JOSEPH A. VANCE, D.D.,
Detroit, Mich. |
| DR. HENRY T. HODGKIN,
Shanghai, China. | BISHOP BOYD VINCENT,
Cincinnati, Ohio. |
| REV. FINIS S. IDLEMAN, D.D.,
New York, N. Y. | THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK,
York, England. |
| DEAN W. R. INGE,
London, England. | |

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

APRIL, 1929

AT THE EDITOR'S DESK

The Passing of Bishop Charles H. Brent

As we go to press a cablegram from Europe comes announcing the death of Bishop Charles H. Brent. We are not greatly surprised because his physical condition has been serious for some years, but we are deeply distressed. He was truly one of the Lord's noblemen, who commanded confidence among all Christians. He was true, fearless, and humble. The cause of Christian unity has lost one of its very chief leaders. He made possible the World Conference on Faith and Order and his great and humble spirit was one of the largest factors in carrying that difficult conference to its close. He told us, after the conference was over, that several times during the conference his pains were so severe that he thought he was passing away; but, to all outward appearances, there was that kind, calm, and devout spirit, undisturbed, directing the affairs of the conference. When the editor of this journal suggested to the conference the celebration of the Lord's supper at its close, he afterwards apologized to Bishop Brent for making such an impossible suggestion, to which came the immediate answer: "There is no apology needed. I am glad you made the suggestion. While it would be difficult to do it now, the time is coming when we have got to do it." This is a type of his forward look. We shall ask one of his colleagues to contribute an expression of appreciation for our next issue.

Denominational Currents

THE rise and development of denominations form a medley of paradoxes. There is no denomination but that started forth to lift a little higher the Christian standard; then after a while it dropped to the level either from which it sprung or to the level of the enviroing denominations. The Disciples present

an interesting illustration of this. They started out with a passion for Christian unity. That was the only moral right of their place in the confused and complex status of the church. Certainly the introduction of another rival denomination was one too many in the sight of God and men.

Nearly a hundred years have passed and the great body of the Disciples evince no more interest in Christian unity than the great body of any other denomination. They are pursuing the characteristic course of all denominations in trying to save themselves, finding satisfaction in their numerical strength, property holdings, and such things.

There are among them two distinct groups — those contending for standpattism and those for open membership. The same classification may apply, more or less, to other denominations, and there are Christians in both of these groups. But Christian unity has a minor place in the thought of the standpatters. The open membership group is not large, but it is growing. With this group lies the hope of the Disciples in being freed from literalism and denominationalism. Should these advocates withdraw from the Disciples, as some have done because of irritations and restrictions, the Disciples would quickly drop to a place with the smaller and more literalistic denominations. Their great numbers could not save them. The literalistic interpretations and denominational attitude, functioning without protests, would become definite handicaps to their progress.

On the recent completion of the Disciples Divinity House of the University of Chicago the liberal element among the Disciples took a decided step forward. It not only indicated permanency in their purposes, but the Disciples Divinity House stands as the open gate of the Disciples' hope. Especially to Dr. Herbert L. Willett, professor of oriental languages and literature in the University of Chicago, and to Dr. Edward Scribner Ames, of the department of philosophy of the University of Chicago, and to Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, editor of *The Christian Century* are Disciples to pay their gratitude to

these courageous leaders who have contended for the widening of the gates of Disciple understanding. There have been others with them in Chicago and out of Chicago, especially Dr. John Ray Ewers of Pittsburgh, Dr. Finis S. Idleman of New York, and Dr. Burris A. Jenkins of Kansas City, until now throughout the Disciples are men and women of liberal outlook and sympathetic coöperation with other Christians. It is possible that another generation of the Disciples may reinterpret the passion of the first generation of the Disciples for Christian unity, so that the Disciples as a body may make a real contribution to this urgent cause. It will take time, patience, courage, and determination. The thing is right and it must be done.

The Kansas City Conference

THE Mid-West Christian Unity Conference of the Christian Unity League at Kansas City made a fine contribution to Christian unity idealism. The city is one of the progressive centers of middle west activities and nearly all the roads going to the Pacific coast pass through its commodious union station. The conference was the guest of the Linwood Christian Church, one of the prominent churches of the city, where Dr. Burris A. Jenkins has ministered for many years.

The day the conference opened the papers reported that it was the coldest weather in the middle west for forty years. Add to that a drizzling rain and sleety streets with a multitude of accidents to pedestrians and automobiles and the day was anything but propitious for a conference of any kind. But the conference opened with sixty-seven persons from twelve denominations from five states. Others came later. In the evening there were several hundred. People are interested in Christian unity, irrespective of the denomination of which they may be members. The whole church is becoming wearied of denominationalism.

On the first day Rev. J. Edgar Williams, a Friend, presided. The devotional period beginning the opening session was purposely given a longer time than ordinarily. There was no

one who could make so well the path for our approach to God as Dr. Claudius B. Spencer, a Methodist, editor of *The Central Christian Advocate*. This was followed by three speakers: Rev. Ross W. Sanderson, a Congregationalist, secretary of the Wichita Council of Churches, Wichita, Kansas; Rev. Cliff Titus, minister of the First Community Church of Christ, Joplin, Mo.; and Rev. M. Ashby Jones, pastor of the Second Baptist Church, St. Louis. The first spoke for federation, the second for the community church, and the third for the co-operation of the denominations.

In the early afternoon the conference was divided into groups to which various subjects were assigned for discussion. At 4:30 the whole conference reconvened for a discussion of the findings of the group conferences. In the evening Dr. Edward Scribner Ames of the University of Chicago was to have spoken, but a telegram came announcing his illness and the editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly* spoke, the meeting being presided over by Rev. Irvin E. Deer, a Moravian.

The second day started with good audiences. Rev. Carl Agee of Columbia, Mo., a Disciple, presided. Rev. Ivan Lee Holt, minister of St. John's Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was to make the first address, but a telegram came announcing his illness. Other telegrams and letters came from persons who expected to attend but who were prevented on account of illness which seemed to have been almost an epidemic. But there were four speakers for the morning: Rev. Harry Clayton Rogers, a Presbyterian; Dr. Edwin D. Starbuck, University of Iowa; Rev. Samuel Harkness, a Presbyterian; and Rev. David J. Evans, a Baptist. The first spoke on unity in missionary work, the second on unity in education, the third on the difficulties in the way of unity, and the fourth on the next steps toward unity.

The entire afternoon was given over to free discussion on the findings. Rev. Burris A. Jenkins was the chairman of this committee. Out of the discussion he prepared the final draft, which appears on another page. It is a commendable document.

In the evening Rev. Robert Nelson Spencer, an Episcopalian, preached a sermon on "The Cross the Symbol of Unity" followed by the observance of the Lord's supper, conducted by Dr. Jenkins. It was a fine conference all through.

Dr. Rogers and Intercommunion Again

FOLLOWING up what appeared in the last issue of *The Christian Union Quarterly* in Rev. Dr. B. Talbot Rogers' protest against intercommunion and our advocacy of intercommunion, our friend writes us again, sending us some questions to answer which we are glad to do. His letter is as follows:

THE RECTORY

Danville, Pa.

My dear Dr. Ainslie:—

* * * * *

Not to argue in place of conference, nor with any unkindness intended, but purely as a matter of psychology: do you think disloyalty to a group to which you belong can add good-will or unity between groups? In the last extreme does a traitor add to the prospects of peace?

Surely conferences imply loyalty to the authority of those whom we represent, and our differences need mutual consideration before they can be authoritatively modified as a possible result of conference.

Sincerely yours,

B. TALBOT ROGERS.

We give a large place to conference in all our approaches to Christian unity. It is the way of understanding and has in it great possibilities. There are no differences among the churches but that should be considered in conference. In no instance can it be said that there has ever been an attempt to hurry the churches into unity. There is no method by which this can be done. Every student of these affairs knows that to hurry the churches into unity would be as futile as to attempt to hurry the revolution of the earth on its axis. The nations can get together and form a league, but not the churches!

Nevertheless there are Christians in all churches who are more friendly than the traditions of their churches would ordinarily permit them to be. They are natural souls that have

freed themselves from the artificial prohibitions of their churches and this group of Christians is increasing around the world. Their attitudes register our possibilities toward Christian unity. The editor of *The Christian Union Quarterly* is a comrad with this freer group of Christians who are in all the churches.

Dr. Rogers' questions raise other questions. Is it disloyal to one's church to dissent from some of the interpretations of that church? Dr. Rogers' church presents a fine illustration for an answer to this question. In his church there are those who practice intercommunion with other Christians and there are those who dissent from that practice. Which of these groups is disloyal to the Protestant Episcopal Church? This would be a difficult question for Episcopalians to answer, if they contend that a certain canon has only one interpretation. As a matter of fact neither of these groups is disloyal. Each interprets the canon as he sees it.

To speak of either interpreter as "a traitor" is not the language of conference nor of science; it is more the language of rigid theology. Those Episcopalians who practice intercommunion and those Baptists and Disciples who practice open membership, which is to receive persons from other churches into their churches without rebaptism, are no less members of their churches than those who stand for a more rigid policy.

Certainly those who dissent from the rigid policies of their churches are the people who are contributing most to good-will and unity among Christians. The hope of a united Christendom lies largely with those who are changing their denominational attitudes and entering into fellowship with other Christians. On the other hand, there are in all churches those who hold to rigid interpretations. It is this element, however, that is keeping the churches divided. So long as they continue their rigid policies there will be two hundred denominations in America and proportionately elsewhere. If the Episcopalians propose to continue the more rigid policy, why not the Baptists, Disciples, and the other one hundred and ninety-seven?

As a matter of psychology, which our friend, Dr. Rogers, raises, nothing could be more harmful to Christian unity than for the rigid policy to become the prevailing policy in all the churches. It was once. We will not think of such a deplorable condition again, for the tides are all against it. There are marked changes of attitude going on in Dr. Rogers' church and the hope for its service among the other churches lies in its changing attitude.

This brings us to another question which has to do with the lesser and greater loyalties. The lesser loyalty is to the denomination. The greater loyalty is to Christ and the whole divided church. Which loyalty should have precedence? We are living in a scientific age. Science has made its advance by experimentation. All over the world the rigidity of the churches has been gradually yielding to experimentation. The old policies are giving way to other policies that center around Christ and the universal church rather than around dogmas, methods of government, forms of baptism, or whatnot.

The Protestant churches may accept episcopacy in the years to come. We are not able to look into the future and say what other generations will do. It is a method of government that has in it many elements of merit. If Dr. Rogers insists, however, that the Protestant Episcopal Church stand aloof from the Lord's supper, while other Christians are celebrating it, until all Protestants become Episcopalians, it will never be done. That is poor psychology. If episcopacy is adopted by the Protestantism of the future it will be through the friendly fellowship of the Protestant Episcopal Church with the other churches of Protestantism, rather than through the opposite policy.

The Episcopalians have an opportunity which they can use or discard. They can go to Rome, which thousands of their members are doing every year, singly and in penitence to the chair of Peter; or they can become leaders for Protestant unity, which is the next great move for a united Christendom; or they can officially remain aloof from Rome because Rome will

not recognize them; or officially aloof from Protestantism because they will not recognize Protestants as equals with them before God, while other forces are making for the unity of Christendom. As to what their choice will be only Episcopalians can decide. But superior attitudes have lost their power in this generation. There are more people thinking to-day than ever in the history of the world and fewer people are taking their thoughts secondhand than ever before.

It is right for Christians to fellowship together and, if their church customs prohibit it, those customs are going to be infringed upon by a free thinking people in experimentation toward brotherhood. This can no more be stopped than experimentations in chemistry or electricity.

We are coming face to face more and more to that still harder question: If two brothers of different denominations cannot partake of the Lord's supper together can they, under any circumstances, pray together? Unless prayer is merely the saying of words the answer must be in the negative. It is this whole approach to God and to each other that underlies all Christian unity conferences, more important than any question discussed at Lausanne, more important than any other question before us to-day. If prayer is to be real, whether it is a conference with the Lord's supper or a conference without the Lord's supper, all barriers have got to go down if we are to find our way to God and to each other. The Lord's supper is a help in revealing him who pleased not himself in making the cross the symbol of our brotherhood. The reality of worship must be a factor in helping us out of our impenitent attitudes of denominationalism into the penitent attitude of a united brotherhood around Jesus Christ our Lord. And it is not nearly so easy as playing loyal to our denominational standards. But it is the way that is right.

Will the Churches Sign a Reconciliation Pact Among Themselves?

ONE of the most remarkable documents in history is the peace pact between the political governments of the world,

adhered to by many of the nations and, on January 15, 1929, ratified by the United States senate and, two days after, signed by the president and the secretary of state. It reads as follows:

"The high contracting parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another."

"The high contracting parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means."

There is hardly another document in history to be compared to this. Remarkably brief, containing only seventy-eight words, clear as a crystal in its outlawry of war, it registers the opening of a new era in the calendar of the world. Henceforth nations are to face the difficult task of organizing for peace, difficult because through all history they have organized for war. It will not be discouraging if there are some failures, but the ideal has been released as the standard of the world. War is an outlaw. A new day has come. The integrity of the nations is challenged as never before. It is the triumph of an idealism that must take its place by the side of those miraculous achievements in modern science. A new world is coming into being.

But where are the churches with their contribution of brotherhood? Is it possible for them to form a league of co-operation or sign an agreement for the abandonment of their isolations? The scientists and statesmen are moving forward with results that may be classified as modern miracles. Once there was a miraculous power in the church; but in the luxury of their denominational pride the churches—Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican, and Protestant—have revealed an amazing contentment in their isolations. Long ago Christ said that a kingdom divided against itself cannot stand.

It is true that the churches are not fighting each other now; neither are the French and Germans; but on the boundary line between France and Germany are many fortresses. The churches have their magnificent buildings, many of them beauti-

ful and worshipful, but so long as the churches are divided these buildings are the fortresses of a denominational Christendom. Is there no hope for a convincing expression of brotherhood among Christians?~Are the churches to remain forever the most backward organizations in brotherhood? Is not the whole world eager for something beyond what the churches are now giving? Is the reality of a united Christendom possible?

Federation is doing a commendable work among Protestants, but those churches that are in federation are moving very slowly toward each other. The Conference on Life and Work and the Conference on Faith and Order have made contributions to the conference idea, but the churches in these gatherings show marked caution. Other churches which are not included are even more reticent in their attitudes.

The scientists make their adventures and get permanent results for the blessing of mankind. So do statesmen, and we have the League of Nations, the International Court, and the outlawry of war — great steps in moral progress. But the churches are hesitant in adventures in understanding and appreciation of other Christians than those of their own churches. Consequently these times are not impressed either by our faith or our love, and an unbelieving world is the price we are paying for our divisions.

As a venture to break into these denominational isolations and contentments, a reconciliation pact between the churches was drafted and courteously submitted to one hundred American Christians — Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Protestant. With the exception of about one-third of the names associated with those denominations that do not coöperate with other Christians; or, if they do, do it hesitantly, the remainder, it was thought, would likely sign it; or, if unable to sign it because of denominational or personal reasons, they would, at least, be sympathetic toward the idea conveyed by the reconciliation pact. Some responded by telegrams, others by enthusiastic expressions of coöperation, and all who signed it appeared to have done so most willingly and without reservations.

Some dissented from signing for various reasons; others would sign it with reservations. Among these latter Bishop John G. Murray, presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Baltimore, wrote that he would sign part of it, into the second paragraph, which referred to conferences, closing with the words, "that are looking toward reconciliation of the divided church of Christ." But Bishop Edward L. Parsons, Protestant Episcopalian, San Francisco, goes further. He wrote:

My dear Dr. Ainslie:

I am entirely in sympathy with your reconciliation pact for the churches. So far as its main purpose is concerned I have practiced it to the full of my ability. So far as the details are concerned I have done the same whenever and wherever my obedience to the order of my own church will permit. And I may add that I cannot see but that it permits all that the pact requires. I believe in the equality of all Christians before God. With my own church, I accept all baptized Christians as members of Christ's church. With great numbers of the clergy and laity of the Episcopal Church I interpret its "law" as in no way forbidding us to welcome Christians of other communions at the Lord's supper. That is in accord with the expressed approval of the last Lambeth Conference (of bishops of the Anglican communion); and I have steadily interpreted our "law" concerning the use of the pulpit in accordance with that same conference's judgment. I have given permission wherever I have felt it would further the cause of unity and I have never denied it on purely ecclesiastical grounds.

If my understanding is correct, therefore, I am glad to sign the pact. But I may note that the situation of those who belong to communions like mine, closely knit and law-governed, differs greatly from that of those who belong to congregationally organized bodies. We Episcopalians cannot help matters by breaking laws for the *attitude* of lawlessness would be fatal to the cause we have at heart. We can and must agitate for the right interpretation of the laws we have and for their change if we think them wrongly restrictive. But we cannot act merely as individuals. The Kellogg peace pact is an expression of national policy. Its analogue in the Christian world would be found in declarations of policy by the great communions acting officially. My earnest prayer is that the reconciliation pact of individuals may be completed by one entered into by the churches and that that may lead us on to the unity for which we pray.

Yours faithfully,

EDWARD L. PARSONS.

The reconciliation pact between the churches is very simple. It affirms the need of a united Christendom in order to Christianize the world, and the steps toward that accomplishment are (1) conferences between Christians who differ, (2) practicing equality of all Christians before God, and (3) pledging to be brethren one to another. These statements might have been put into the very words of Jesus. They are his ideals. The reconciliation pact is an attempt to call us to his ideals and his Spirit. Some years ago, in a letter from the late Cardinal Gibbons, he expressed regret that we were not further along now so that we could do these things, and assured us of his prayers to that end. But in this instance the four American Roman Catholic cardinals did not answer; neither did the Eastern Orthodox, nor some of the Protestant bodies — in all fourteen persons did not answer. Thirteen wrote declining to sign the pact for various reasons; five were willing to sign with reservations; and five were out of the country. It is signed by sixty-three persons from fifteen denominations that aggregate in membership more than 16,000,000. Some in all these denominations would dissent from the reconciliation pact; in some instances many would dissent; but, on the other hand, the fact is that sixty-three persons from these denominations have signed the reconciliation pact and there are thousands in all these denominations who stand with these sixty-three signers. It is a significant observation of conditions among the churches. The reconciliation pact is as follows:

“We, Christians of various churches, believing that only in a coöperative and united Christendom can the world be Christianized, deplore a divided Christendom as being opposed to the Spirit of Christ and the needs of the world; and we are convinced that the Christianizing of the world is greatly hindered by divisive and rivaling churches.

“We, therefore, desire to express our sympathetic interest in and prayerful attitude toward all conferences, small and large, that are looking toward reconciliation of the divided church of Christ; and we propose to practice, in all our spiritual fellowships, the equality of all Christians before God, so that no Christian shall be denied membership in our churches, nor a place in our celebration of the Lord’s supper, nor any ministry be denied the courtesies of our pulpits; and, further, irrespective of denominational

barriers, we pledge to be brethren one to another in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Savior, whose we are and whom we serve."

PETER AINSLIE

Editor *The Christian Union Quarterly*, Baltimore, Md.

EDWARD SCRIBNER AMES

Minister University Church of Disciples of Christ, Chicago.

WILLIAM F. ANDERSON

Bishop Methodist Episcopal Church, Boston, Mass.

ROBERT A. ASHWORTH

Minister Baptist Church of the Redeemer, Yonkers, N. Y.

HENRY PEARCE ATKINS

Executive Secretary Federation of Churches, Cincinnati, Ohio

ROBERT BAGNELL

Minister Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, Harrisburg, Pa.

EDWARD BLEAKNEY

Pastor Mount Lebanon Baptist Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.

ARTHUR J. BROWN

Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., New York

CHARLES R. BROWN

Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.

WILLIAM HORACE DAY

The United Church, Bridgeport, Conn.

OZORA S. DAVIS

President Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago

H. L. ELDERDICE

President Westminster Theological Seminary, Westminster, Md.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN

Former Moderator General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., Princeton, N. J.

JOHN RAY EWERS

Minister East End Christian Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.

W. H. P. FAUNCE

President Brown University, Providence, R. I.

CHARLES W. FLINT

Chancellor Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK

Union Theological Seminary, New York

ARCHBISHOP FREDERIC

American Catholic Church, Chicago

CHARLES W. GILKEY

Dean of the Chapel University of Chicago, Chicago

W. A. HARPER

President Elon College, N. C.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

HUGH L. HODGE

Minister First Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, Md.

P. E. HOLDCRAFT

Minister Third United Brethren Church, Baltimore, Md.

HAMILTON HOLT

President Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.

LYNN HAROLD HOUGH

Minister American Presbyterian Church, Montreal, Canada

ROY M. HOUGHTON

Pastor Congregational Church of the Redeemer, New Haven, Conn.

FINIS S. IDLEMAN

Minister Central Church of Disciples, New York

CHARLES E. JEFFERSON

Minister Broadway Tabernacle Church, New York

BURRIS A. JENKINS

Minister Linwood Christian Church, Kansas City

RUFUS M. JONES

Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.

M. ASHBY JONES

Minister Second Baptist Church, St. Louis, Mo.

EDGAR DEWITT JONES

Minister Central Woodward Christian Church, Detroit, Mich.

ELIZA H. KENDRICK

Department of Biblical History, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.

ROBERT G. LEETCH

Minister Second Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, Md.

FREDERICK LYNCH

Educational Secretary Church Peace Union, New York

FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL

Bishop Methodist Episcopal Church, New York

JOHN H. MACCRACKEN

President Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.

L. W. MCCREARY

Pastor Park Ave. Church, Disciples of Christ, East Orange, N. J.

WILLIAM P. MERRILL

Minister Brick Presbyterian Church, New York

CHARLES L. MEAD

Bishop Methodist Episcopal Church, Denver, Col.

CARL E. MILLIKEN

President American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, Portland, Maine

CHARLES CLAYTON MORRISON

Editor *The Christian Century*, Chicago

EDWIN D. MOUZON

Bishop Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Charlotte, N. C.

REINHOLD NEIBUHR

Union Theological Seminary, New York

FRANK H. NELSON

Rector Christ Protestant Episcopal Church, Cincinnati, Ohio

ROBERT NORWOOD

Rector St. Bartholomew's Protestant Episcopal Church, New York

EDWARD L. PARSONS

Bishop Protestant Episcopal Church, San Francisco, Calif.

DANIEL A. POLING

Editor *The Christian Herald*, New York

ROCKWELL HARMON POTTER

Dean Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.

KARL REILAND

Rector St. George's Protestant Episcopal Church, New York

GEORGE W. RICHARDS

President Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa.

IVAN MURRAY ROSE

Minister First Baptist Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

GUY EMERY SHIPLER

Editor *The Churchman*, New York

GAIUS J. SLOSSER

Department of Church History and History of Doctrine, Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa.

EDMUND S. SOPER

President Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio

J. M. SHAW

Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

WILSON R. STEARLY

Bishop Protestant Episcopal Church, Newark, N. J.

EDWARD A. STEINER

Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa

W. O. THOMPSON

President Emeritus Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

ERNEST F. TITTLE

Minister First Methodist Episcopal Church, Evanston, Ill.

BEVERLY D. TUCKER, JR.

Rector St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, Richmond, Va.

MORRIS H. TURK

Minister Williston Congregational Church, Portland, Maine

LUTHER A. WEIGLE

Dean Divinity School, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

HERBERT L. WILLETT

Disciples Divinity House, University of Chicago, Chicago

THE OUTLOOK FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY

BY REV. KARL REILAND, D. D.

Rector of St. George's Protestant Episcopal Church, New York

THE Christian churches are rightly concerned about the prospect of their future which from more than one indication does not inspire confidence nor promise continuance. The Protestant bodies are struggling to sustain an increasingly heavy load of problems which for the most part are too much for them, both because they have few leaders and because the few they have do not know where to lead. There has been for some years a remarkably inflated enthusiasm for church unity with commissions and cash at its disposal, but the results of both speaking and spending have been negligible and the net notions are nebulous. Inflated enthusiasm is not a bad term — as Bishop Brent has somewhere said that it is “time to come down out of the air about this matter” and deal with it on earth. This is an implication of value because it manifests an unexpected awareness of the hitherto atmospheric environment of this whole question to date which has been treated not as a magnificent ideal but as a medieval idea.

The church unity mind has been dreaming of “organic unity,” a vast monarchy held together by agreement upon theological and dogmatic residua; an article of faith and a form of order; on the assumptions of divine authority for faith and devolved antiquity for form. The Protestant Episcopal Church, taking the initiative, has enjoyed reference to itself — mostly by itself — as a “bridge” between the church of catholicity and the churches of non-conformity. The ecclesiastical engineers, both Anglican and Roman, understand each other much better than they did since a definite judgment from the

Vatican was vouchsafed to them. And in England there is a conviction that there will be no abutment for this benevolent "bridge" on the Tiber, whatever may be done with the Thames. It has not been the custom curiously enough to consult non-conformity overmuch about the proposed structure, believing, I suppose, that, if Anglican achievement could plant one terminal in Rome, non-conformity would have to repent and receive the other. But alas! the dream of satisfaction is over and the awakened conscience is having the experience of reaction. "That's the humor of it," as Nym would say.

We now have an attractive suggestion to copy a Canadian model and attempt unity with the more docile and susceptible non-conformists and to this end proposals are made for conference with Presbyterians and Methodists. The Presbyterians and Methodists seem able to restrain their enthusiasm over the prospect for they know well from previous conversations what to expect. There is always a chance, however, that they have become more amenable with the passage of time and the persuasion of talk and are more willing than ever to hear what may be said on behalf of this new method of approach. If they come with an appetite for apostolic succession and a fairly good doctrinal digestion it is possible some scheme of union may be effected. It is difficult to see how this American Episcopal Church can act differently from the Church of England and, unless it does, our brethren of other communions will be asked to accept Episcopal reordination, the Apostles or Nicene Creed and some sacramental technique. The real situation may be clearly and graphically set forth by quoting the following incident:

"At a 'fraternal' of English clergymen and Free Church ministers, an Anglican vicar read a paper on 'The Sacramental Principle.' At its conclusion a scholarly Methodist minister said, 'Probably all will agree with what has been said about the sacramental principle, but we need to understand its implications and applications. Will our Anglican brother answer the following questions?

“(1) ‘When you pronounce the formula of consecration over the sacramental bread, does a change take place?’

The Anglican answered, ‘Yes.’

“(2) ‘If I pronounce the same formula do you believe that a change takes place?’

The Anglican answered, ‘No.’

“(3) ‘Does the change take place because of your superior morality?’

The Anglican answered, ‘Certainly not.’

“(4) ‘Is it then because of your superior spirituality?’

The Anglican answered, ‘Certainly not.’

“(5) ‘If that be so, why then does our Anglican brother object to Bishop Barnes calling the change magical?’

This led to a really vital discussion.”

This points to the real difficulty in this whole affair of unity which is the authority or validity of ministerial orders. The Episcopal Church does not believe that ministers of other communions are ministers in the sense in which it uses this term for its own clergy. No Presbyterian or Methodist can legally come into an Episcopal church and administer the sacraments of communion or baptism. To all intents and purposes he is a layman and nothing more and at such time as he is received in the Episcopal Church on what are called “special occasions” he is so regarded — officially. The church is careful to say that it “admits the rich spiritual fruits,” etc. of others’ ministry but it regards these fruits as those noticeable among Christian men anywhere and not as ecclesiastically “*valid*” according to its particular conception of orthodox ministerial authority. Of course it goes without saying that there are many among us who do not believe or teach nor practice these principles. Personally I would admit any ordained Christian minister to this church and would gladly have him administer every sacrament, ceremony or rite, without a question of his validity. I regard the official attitude of the Episcopal Church as merely

perpetuating the unchristian action pattern of its historic hypocrisy. Apostolic succession, with all its implications, is not valid; it is vicious. No one doubts its churchianity; no one informed believes its Christianity. No one questions the tradition; no one, without prejudice, sanctions its truth.

The late Seth Low, a vestryman of St. George's Church, New York, made a fine suggestion which ought to be represented, especially as it would serve to test the sincerity of those church unity leaders who are keen to make a "venture for God" to do something "daring" and to "get somewhere" out of the air, onto the earth.

"The writer clearly recognizes that there are many other obstacles than the constitution of the ministry, to the complete reunion of Christendom; but it is clear that, if a ministry can be created, universally, which every existing church may consider valid, a great step will have been taken toward Christian unity. His proposal, then, is definitely this: To avoid complications, he limits his illustrations to the United States; but, if the idea should be accepted, it can evidently be worked out anywhere along parallel lines.

"It is suggested that the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States should propose, say, to the Presbyterian Church, to the Methodist Episcopal Church, to the Reformed Church, and to the Baptist Church*, in the United States, that after 19.... all ordinations to the ministry in any of these churches should be made in common; that is to say, that, in every case, a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church and one minister from each of these churches should take part in every such ordination. It should be understood that ministers so ordained should be ordained, at the outset in each instance, only for the church to which they belong. This would avoid a thousand questions of detail; but, at the end of a generation, every one of these churches would have a ministry that all would consider valid, and evidently the next step toward Christian unity would be, by so much, the easier.

* These churches are suggested as typical, and not with the intention of overlooking other Protestant churches. Evidently the plan, if accepted by any church, could be adapted equally well in other cases.—S.L.

“The attitude of any church proposing this plan of procedure to another church,—for it can evidently be proposed by any one of those churches as well as by the Protestant Episcopal Church,—would naturally be the attitude in which all the churches were represented at the Edinburgh Conference. No one is to be expected to abandon any of his own conceptions as to what constitutes a valid ministry, but each church is to share with the other churches in respect to ordination whatever it has to give. In other words, instead of discussing further what constitutes a valid ministry, why not unite in creating a ministry which all will consider valid? Those who believe that Episcopal ordination is necessary would thus have the happiness of helping to give such ordination to the ministers of the coöperating churches; while those who do not believe that Episcopal ordination is necessary, and who consider it of no special value, will, nevertheless, continue to have a ministry, which, though episcopally ordained, will also be ordained in the way which they believe to be desirable or essential. The essence of the suggestion is, that all this can be done without waiting to bring about an agreement as to the theoretical requirements for a valid ministry.”

From another point of view there is not the slightest need of engaging in this exchange of orders. A synchronous expedient of this sort need be resorted to only if clerical obstinacy persists in specific claims which have no reasonable standing whatever on the basis of early Christian history. One feature of that history from the labors of St. Paul constitutes an unanswerable argument on this question of orders and no one can refute it without being ridiculous. By common consent St. Paul was the most ubiquitous of the apostles and founded the Gentile churches, regulating their affairs and ordaining the ministry. Curiously enough he was never ordained himself, was not in favor with the rest of the apostolic order and never saw Jesus in the flesh. The only appointment he ever received came from laymen outside of Jerusalem. He says all this himself and glories in the facts. By common consent also he is regarded as the chief apostle of them all and yet this apostolic cross-

section of actual history is not even discussed in its bearing on the present day attempts at church unity. Officially the ministerial origins are carefully ignored and the organization of ecclesiastical politicians a little later is faithfully honored. It is not as it should be a question of what was then and how things began, but only what is now and that it became. Yet this is a day when we are all supposed to be seeking the real facts about the historic Jesus and are engaged in freeing Christianity from the undoubted incrustations with which it has been so long obscured. We are trying to get at "the religion of Jesus" instead of "the religion about Jesus." Anglican insistence is actually based upon man-made features of ministerial organization and every student of beginnings knows it. There is no reason why modern men should perpetuate the faults and false constructions of antiquity and make them the obstacles to unity. The fact of the matter is there is no justification in reason, revelation, or scriptural rendering for reordination, for present divisions or for sacramental separatism in any church on earth. It requires nothing but that humility and common sense should get into these multiplied foregatherings on unity. It needs less prayer for "unhappy divisions" and more penitence for unwieldly dispositions; something to clear up this unspiritual septicæmia, some potent hypodermic to scatter the toxin of tradition and cure this chronic absorption of authority and mistaken reverence for antiquity. All we need is a free, fair, open, and honest recognition of each others' ministry without any reordination, reservation, or recommendation. Unless these unwarranted specific claims yield there will be no spiritual unity and the only unity worth anything is "the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace."

Organic unity is nonsense. We have a stupid mania that we shall be saved by our much organization. We cannot get and do not want a bank merger. We are not eager for a primate or a pope. Institutional diversity is attractive and natural. We do not require more than the establishment of courteous comradeship and intercommunion, preserving the identity of

each several church while we live as free blood brothers "in honor preferring one another."

Christian recognition, then, is the reformation we ought to work for with diversity in the spirit of unity. Free exchange in our pulpits, at the font and before our altars and, if that day comes, the disintegration of the churches — now going on — will cease; the erosion will end and the spiritual unity will be impressive to all men everywhere. Unless something is done and done soon the Community churches, with their economic sense and their spiritual aim, will wipe out the vicious denominational lines we have drawn and much denominational property will be for sale. Organized churches will suffer a loss of income as they are already doing from this cause; and the people will do for themselves what the priests will not do for them, i.e., create a church of Christians who would see Jesus, and substitute a real Christianity for the rank churchianity we have to-day. I regard the Community Church as the most therapeutic threat our stubborn self-sufficiency has encountered and it deserves encouragement and support.

There must have been some happy star in the ascendent, whose benign influence caused an automatic utterance to be delivered at the time of the Washington convention which made sense on this question of Christian unity conference. It was urged that "young men" should represent the churches in discussion hereafter. It was a good suggestion and fifty years ought to be the limit set. That would exclude leadership that has actually become unfortunate. Discussions heretofore have been too much involved with limpid emotions and lethargic actions. It is not surprising for action patterns have a way of hardening like the arteries, the mental muscles lose elasticity and the nervous centers vitality and old leaders see only the familiar features of their fetish notions. It would be a work well worthy of reward for someone to write a monograph showing how much theological and religious perversion — and persistence in it — has been due to physiological changes and the ossification of sometime plastic centers. This business of

thought and mental attitude has a natural history as certain as geological deposit or biological evolution. Cicero has a line that young men ruined the state and old men saved it, but from the accident of his early birth he did not refer to the state of the church or he would have reversed his opinion. Be that as it surely is our younger men — unless their training is unfortunate — are not likely to mark time and are not likely to be the residuary legatees of the “rich heritage” of atavism. They are more willing in ecclesiastics to leave medievalism to the museums and antiquity to the archives. At any rate it will be refreshing to see what they will do with Christian unity if the suggestion to use them is effective. They will not be hampered by reputation nor by that difficult and dedicated “conscience” which has made trouble for us all. The direction of Christian unity is away from the enigma that is Greek and the dogma that is Rome and toward non-conformity where there is promise of understanding fellowship. The nature of Christian unity is not institutional form but spiritual fellowship — not one church but one character. To quote our Lord’s words “that they may be one” in relation to organic unity of the churches, as so many have done at Lausanne and elsewhere, is absurd and serves only as a confession of the level of thought which such an abuse indicates. There is a wide difference between education and training, between appreciation and acquisition.

God give the unsuspecting Presbyterians and Methodists grace to sustain the impact of whatever is in store for them and conform their minds to some counter proposals more Christ-like than churchly, more human than historic, more spiritual than sacerdotal, and more Christian than all.

KARL REILAND

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ITALO-VATICAN CONCORDAT FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY

BY REV. FREDERICK LYNCH, D. D.

Educational Secretary of the Church Peace Union, New York

I HAVE been asked to say something about the implications for Christian unity of the restoration of the Vatican state to the pope. It is difficult to know whether this momentous act is going to bring the Protestant and Catholic churches into closer fellowship or not. So far as actual unity is concerned it will not affect it one way or another. There are very few people — only a small group in the Anglican Church — who have even the slightest hope that Rome will seriously discuss unity until the Protestant communions are ready to abandon many of their deepest convictions and practically make a submission to Rome. That is so improbable that probably we can dismiss the whole question of organic unity at once so far as the Protestant and Catholic churches are concerned. The concordat will not affect it one way or another because it is not really even a remote probability. Protestants do not want it until Rome changes her whole nature and Rome does not want it until Protestants become Catholics. But it is perhaps perfectly natural that many should be asking what effect will the concordat have upon the coöperation of the Protestant and Catholic churches in the service of the world. Does it promise further coöperation — for there have been some beginnings of it — or less? Is united action of the two great bodies against the paganism of the world more of a probability or less? Can we hope, more than we have dared to, for concerted action, or even conference together, in the Christian movement to banish war and all injustices, and build the city of God in the world,

or is that hope more than ever to be deferred? It is proper to ask these questions even though we may not answer them.

I think most Protestants had the feeling when they read the news that the pope had regained his political sovereignty that it widened the existing breach between Catholicism and Protestantism by vast distances, and removed all hope of unity or even coöperation far, far into the future. For the restoration of political sovereignty to the pope is going greatly to increase his power and prestige and it puts a weapon in his hands which can be and undoubtedly will be used in furthering the interests of the church. The only reason the popes have worked so ardently and prayed so unceasingly since 1870 for political sovereignty is that they might use it in the extension of the power of the church, and by reason of it, speak more authoritatively in matters concerning the welfare and rights of the church in all countries. The pope is not interested in acquiring a kingdom that he may play a more decisive part in politics but that as a king he can have a voice in everything that in the remotest way affects the Catholic Church. He desired political sovereignty because it opened new ways of extending his spiritual sovereignty over men. And, as I said, it will greatly enhance the power of the church.

This will easily be seen when we remember that now the Vatican will have a seat in the League of Nations. It will have an ambassador at every capital and every country will have its accredited minister to the Vatican. The Vatican state can have delegates on the various committees of the League, as have other governments, and on all international commissions. It can take part in all international conferences of the governments of the world and have a voice in all international agreements. It can speak as a political power where it could not speak as a church. And let us not be deceived by thinking that because the new kingdom is small it will not have weight in the councils of nations. Wherever a representative of the Vatican state appears he will be received and listened to as attentively as though he came from one of the great powers. For it will be impossible

for leagues, governments, counsels, and conferences to disassociate him from the other kingdom. He will be received as one representing a ruler who is sovereign over a universal church with millions of subjects. The pope with only a garden for a kingdom will have as much voice in any council of the nations as the king of England or the presidents of the United States and Germany and France. The ambassador from the Vatican state to the court of St. James will rank as high and have as potent a voice as the ambassador from the United States in spite of the fact that one represents a village with a few hundred people and the other represents half a continent with one hundred and fifteen million people. For the ambassador from the village will never be thought of as representing a village but as representing the great Roman Catholic Church. This is inevitable and the pope knows it and it is this for which the Catholic Church has been fighting and praying for the last sixty years. (I am not writing this in any critical vein. Indeed it is rather refreshing in a time when so many Protestants are apologizing for their church, or giving it half hearted allegiance, or speaking of it as a voluntary society with no more divine authority or right to speak for Christ than has a lodge of Masons or Odd Fellows or Elks or a Rotary Club, to find a church that believes in its divine origin, and boasts of having a direct commission from its Founder to speak for him and with his authority, and dares rebuke governments as well as individuals for sin, and because it believes this so unshakeably, works unceasingly for the extension of its sway in all the spheres of human activity and life.) We may rest assured that the Vatican will seize upon this new political weapon to use it in every possible way to advance the interests of the Catholic Church.

I think we can rest assured that the Roman Catholic Church with all this increased prestige and power, with all the new avenues opened for expansion and influence is not going to worry much about Christian unity or even coöperation with Protestants for some time to come. She is going to use all her

energies, with her new opportunities, to establishing herself more firmly in every country. It should be remembered, too, that the treaty restores the canon law in Italy. This means that not only will marriage be entirely in the hands of the church, but so also will the whole conduct of religious education in the schools of Italy. This means of course that the courses in religion, dropped during the years since 1870, will all be restored and the church will gradually regain the youth of Italy, some of whom have drifted away into free thought, anarchism or secularism at least. This loss of youth has been one of the things the church has most deplored and it is greatly rejoicing that again religious education is to come absolutely into its own hands. Not a boy in Italy will be able to escape it, should he want to. This means that when the church has got reestablished in the schools of Italy, it will be able to turn to the faithful in Austria and France and other Catholic countries and say: "In Italy the children are all being taught in the fundamentals of the faith. Do you want your children to grow up atheists and materialists while the Italian children are growing up in the knowledge of God and Christ and Christian virtue?" If the new system works well in Italy it is going to have a powerful appeal when these questions are asked the other nations. And we may be sure the church is going to ask them at the earliest possible moment and going to spare no pains to capture the schools of Catholic Europe. (Personally I hope she will. I see no more reason why religion should not be taught in the schools than why mathematics should not be, and surely God is as real and plays as much part in life as electricity about which all our pupils are taught.) On the whole, then, the Catholic Church is going to be pretty busy during the next few decades strengthening itself and extending its power in the world with these new instruments of aggression that have come into its hands. One almost wonders if the pope was not sure that all this was coming when he wrote his last encyclical which, in essence, urges the faithful not to worry too much about associating themselves with other groups

either in work or discussion, but knowing themselves to be the one true church of Christ to go forth in that conviction to win the world.

There is, however, another side and there are possibilities — if one may not quite be sure there are probabilities — that the new fraternizing of official Rome with the officials of other lands, and with the interest the popes may personally have in certain great moral and religious movements which Protestant countries and Protestant churchmen are eagerly engaged in that much more coöperation between Catholics and Protestants may come than has been ever previously thought of. Such co-operation may come from the pope as head of the Vatican state rather than from the head of the Roman Church, but it amounts to the same thing in the long run, for Catholics and Protestants will be working together for the same big ends and that is the great thing. Understanding will come out of it, and with understanding suspicions and fears disappear, the differences fade out of consciousness and the similarities emerge and stand out. The feeling of oneness always emerges in any group of divergent faiths when for a considerable time and ardently they confer together or work for any great cause.

Some will remember how ten years ago the Protestants and the Greek Catholics met in conference for the first time. I think that for many Protestants the Eastern Orthodox brethren were as foreign as would be a delegation of cardinals from Rome. After ten years of annual meeting and working together understanding has come and cordial friendliness and above all the sense of unity, with much outward expression of it in common service if not yet in any organic sense. We have at least gone together as far as Stockholm if we have not yet achieved Lausanne. I think something like this may happen in Geneva when the Vatican delegates begin associating with their Protestant brethren in the League of Nations. (It is amazing how little association there has been of Catholics and Protestants even in Europe. The League has made a beginning of it and if now delegates come officially representing the Vatican itself

— something the Vatican has been long hoping for — there will be a beginning of real fellowship of Protestants and Catholics.)

Perhaps on the question of war and peace the new co-operation may come. This is the question which is now most occupying the mind of the world and will probably be its greatest concern for a generation. The present pontiff has the banishment of war and the establishment of peace upon his heart. He will want to play a leading part in creating the new institutions which shall guarantee permanent peace. He will find the Protestant nations and the Protestant churches as eagerly seeking a peaceful world order as he. If he cannot co-operate as the head of the Catholic Church he can as the head of the Vatican state and undoubtedly will. There is much promise for the future here and I look for a unity of purpose and action far exceeding any hitherto experienced among Catholics and Protestants. If the Catholic Church cannot coöperate with Protestant churches the Catholic state can and must co-operate with Protestant states, and it is going to be very difficult to distinguish between the two. For all practical purposes they will be the same. The same principle will obtain in the solving of other world problems.

FREDERICK LYNCH.

COMMUNION

Far, farther than the Isle of Wight
 Whose chalk-white shadows gleam,
 Dim ships stream out to all the world
 Of dreams within a dream.

And *sursum corda* ever sounds,
 And hearts are lifted up
 By loving hills that hold the sea
 Like Wine of Holy Cup.

—*Mary Marquis.*

APPROACHES TO UNITY

BY REV. MORRIS H. TURK, D. D.

Minister of the Williston Congregational Church, Portland, Maine

THE major task of our day is the uniting of a divided world. All other altruistic obligations are included in this supreme duty to humanity. The tragic necessity of healing the jealousies, hatreds, antagonisms, and antipathies of races and religions, nations and peoples, is axiomatic to all persons who think. A divided humanity distresses our deepest instincts of brotherhood; it violates the basic philosophy of Jesus. That these many and unholy separations of men and nations are to continue can be claimed only by an arrant and pagan pessimism. The moral prophets of our time think differently. Above the welter of conflicting forces the spiritual seers of to-day have seen a great vision: the dawning of an era of racial and religious integration, the promise of a fraternal humanity.

As solvents of divisions of whatever dimension or depth those world-forces described as economic, material or national, have been weighed in the balance and found wanting. The ideals and dynamics of the secularists have failed miserably to solve, or even to understand, the problems of the larger unities of mankind. There is a growing belief, not only among churchmen, but also in the non-ecclesiastical areas of modern thought, that in the world philosophy of Christ alone is there to be found that basis of a better world order for which the far seeing souls of every age have toiled and prayed. Some even of the non-Christian seekers for a way out of the jungle are inclined to the trial of Christ's way; the assumption being that his way has not yet been fairly and honestly tested. But the one institution to which has been committed the principles and motives inherent in the kingdom of God is the church of Christ. The Christian churches of all the world hold the key to the peace and unity of the race.

But a divided church can never hope to unite a divided world. The sorrow of the centuries has dwelt in the shadow of Christian divisions. In this present year of our Lord the Christian Church is fronted with a situation indescribable: a broken and divided world in utter need of restoring; and a divided and broken church incapable of meeting the abysmally tragic world necessities with spiritual insight and power. The one and only one institution competent in principle and purpose to rebuild our distracted world order stands weakened by disunion in an hour of crucial destiny. If ever the heart of Jesus was heavy that time is now.

The most heartening events on our world horizon to-day are the eager spiritual impulses that are finding expression in the varied approaches to Christian unity. Edinburgh in 1910, Stockholm in 1925, Lausanne in 1927, and Jerusalem in 1928, have entered church history as epochal years in the growth of Christian solidarity. At Lausanne, for the first time in centuries, leaders of four-score great Christian faiths met together to consider the problems of faith and order. The very fact of the conference was in itself a miracle of Christian fellowship. That the immediate results seemed to be meager does not warrant any concession of failure. That conference accomplished all that it set out to do; namely, to compare divergencies as well as agreements in faith and order as preliminary to later attempts to find constructive principles for unity. And when it is remembered that the long gamut of Christian faiths included all sorts and conditions of ecclesiastics, from the Friends to the Anglo-Catholics, the measure of unanimity achieved testifies to a leadership more than human.

But the Lausanne Conference was only a step, though a noble one, on the long road toward agreement on matters concerning faith and order. The divisions revealed at Lausanne were deep, both in doctrine and polity. Traditions as unlike as oil and water could not coalesce. Disparities of doctrine meticulously interpreted were entirely sufficient to barricade the communion table of our Lord. Ecclesiastical customs and

sectarian opinions were quickly competent to reject, with no apparent shame, the last pleading prayer of our Lord that all his disciples might be one. As men the delegates were generously and graciously brethren beloved. As ecclesiastics devoted to sectarian interests they held aloof. They were lovingly united in Christian fellowship, but widely divided as churchmen. Not even a service of penitence in the great cathedral had any appreciable effect upon the stubborn allegiance of the delegates to their varied and opposing orthodoxies. Constantly professing to seek and obey the mind of Jesus, incessantly exalting him as the great head of the church, the delegates — at least most of them — held to their sectarian position with unswerving tenacity. And I thought I heard One saying, "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?"

The total result of the Lausanne Conference seems at first thought to be disheartening. In reality it was a positive contribution of the first magnitude toward the healing of the broken body of Christ. On its negative side, however, that conference affords a great inside as to the nature of sectarian divisions. The conference had little difficulty in agreeing heartily upon the church's message to the world — the gospel, for this subject was concerned with the redemptive message and ministry of the living Christ. This was the glory of Lausanne. But when the concepts, traditions, and human theories of the church, her ministries, creeds, and sacraments were considered, divergencies both deep and wide were thrust upon the conference with militant aggression and defended with stubborn devotion. The delegates united in a glad acceptance of Christ's gospel; they divided sharply in their sectarian beliefs concerning the church.

The matters that keep our American denominations apart are not Christian essentials; they are ecclesiastical non-essentials. What are we to attempt to do about this un-Christian disunion?

It may help us to make a more vigorous and sacrificial effort toward Christian unity if we will honestly and without

prejudice look the unlovely facts in the face. Let it be declared at once that there is nothing divisive in the life, teachings, or ministry of Christ himself. Every creed, tradition, practice or polity that separates our denominations is not of Christ but of man. The things that divide our churches are man-made, fallible, and non-essential to salvation. Of course these doctrines and polities have had their places as means to an end in the building of the kingdom of God. But they are all secondary matters. We have made the tragic error of putting last things first and first things last. We have exalted our denominational peculiarities at the expense of the evangel of Jesus. Instead of lifting up Christ in his perfect beauty and power we have been holding up our doctrines about him. While constantly proclaiming the august and gentle essentials of the gospel we have also incessantly paraded our precious denominationalisms. We do not at all realize how far we have departed from the pure teachings of Jesus: how sodden we are with matters that have scant concern with his gospel; how devoted we are to traditions and beliefs in which he has little if any interest. In the sectarian emphases of our diverse churchmanship we have all been guilty of dispensing adulterated goods.

With complacent pietism we scorn the Pharisees of an ancient day; yet we continue our denominationalized interpretation of Christianity with an over-load of Pharaseeism not less lovely because it is our own and labeled in modern phrase. Current Pharaseeism is just as much a hindrance to the fulfillment of the will of God in our day as it was in the day of Jesus. "You neglect God's commandments," cried Jesus one day in bitter rebuke, "you hold fast to human traditions." All of our churches need desperately to hear and heed that reproof to-day. Our Chinese brethren understand this far better than ourselves. Perplexed by the denominational versions of Christ's good news a great assembly of Chinese Christians of many faiths and creeds, in 1922 in Shanghai, made courteous but emphatic protest against the infliction upon China of the sectarian editions of the Christian faith by the churches of the

West. "Please keep your denominationalism at home, but send us your Christ" was the passionate plea of these unsophisticated disciples of our Lord. "What a challenge to Christendom," says Bishop Brent, "to set its own house in order before it further infect the Eastern world with a sectarianism that robs the gospel of its corporate power and gives people a stone instead of bread."

The obstacles to union in our home churches are many and powerful; but none of them are insurmountable if we gain a desperate earnestness to overcome them. Much of the difficulty rests in a misunderstanding of the real meaning of unity. Too often unity is regarded as uniformity; but uniformity is not even a near synonym for unity. Unity is possible only through diversity. Dull and static uniformity would prove the death of religion. A standardized church would enslave Christ as much as do our present divisions. In the united-church-to-be not one denomination would need to lose its traditions, customs, beliefs, or ecclesiastical principles. Ancient creeds might still be held as witnesses to our common faith in a living Christ. Discreet concepts concerning the nature of the ministry and the sacraments should still be retained in their respective areas of belief; but with this understanding: that no sectarian belief, practice, tradition or polity be ever used as a test of Christian discipleship, or as a bar to church membership, or as a barrier in any way to the full and complete fellowship of all the constituent groups in the united church.

Approaches to unity have so far been chiefly concerned with the adjustment of divergent creeds and the reconciliation of differing concepts of the nature of the church and her sacraments and ministry. There is already substantial agreement in regard to the commanding essentials of Christian faith and practice. This was conclusively revealed at Lausanne. The matters that divide us are seen to be those intellectual concepts of churchmanship that are neither necessary to salvation nor essential for building the kingdom of God. Clearly then we are attempting to unify that which is not basically necessary to

unity. We are trying to compose elements that are non-essential. We are endeavoring to build a system of transient factors, to create a superficial unity of external and relative agencies that are neither fundamental nor universal. I do not hold that this is inherently impossible. But this plan for unity has a stubborn fact to reckon with. The spiritual seers of every faith to-day are declaring with unmistakable emphasis that sectarianism has had its day; that denominationalism has passed its zenith and in the future is destined to give way to some more efficient type of religious organization. They declare with equal conviction that unless denominationalism rebuilds itself into a more serviceable form of organic life that God himself will provide some more obedient organism to better function as the Body of Christ. But the fact that faces us is this: by the time — and it will be long — by the time that we succeed in unifying these non-essentials of Christian churchmanship they will have ceased to be worth unifying. The progress of the world's thought will have rendered them null and void. The long years of toil and tribulation required to harmonize these denominational differences would end in the unity of elements out-worn, decadent and useless. Future historians would charge us with having unified the relics of a day that was dead.

Why then should we waste our efforts upon the impermanent and the non-essential? Why should we seek to negotiate a unity of transient elements when Christ needs our corporate strength for the building of his world kingdom? Is there not some better road to a united church?

The way to resume specie payment, said a great financier, is to resume. The way to achieve church unity is to begin; to begin here and now. There is one thing that every denomination can do just as soon as it has grace sufficient for it. It is entirely possible for our churches to begin at once to remove every obstacle that would hinder the fellowship of any sincere and earnest Christian in the world. We might begin with our communion tables or altars. There are to-day thousands of churches in our land where Christians who have not entered the Chris-

tian life in some prescribed way are not welcomed; in some they are not wanted. That the holy table of our Lord should be barricaded against any loving heart that yearned to keep faith with the tender request of Jesus, "Do this in remembrance of me!" The time has come when every church should know that it has no proprietary rights in this sacrament of grace that Christ enjoined upon his friends in every church and of every faith. In this no church should be expected to renounce its concept of holy communion, nor to abandon any doctrinal beliefs concerning sacramental grace. It means only that every table and altar of the ever present Christ should be generously free of access to every penitent and worthy disciple of our Lord who seeks renewing grace by keeping the sacred tryst with the Master of his soul. The irenic attitude of Dr. Temple, formerly bishop of Manchester and recently chosen to be archbishop of York, is worthy of our obedient regard. He is one of the great Christian leaders in our generation. At a recent diocesan conference he declared that the Church of England should be ready to welcome to its communion as a normal practice communicants in any recognized body. Here in America there is also a well defined tendency for certain of our churches to pass from "close" to "open communion." Theories of sacramental grace are not thereby deserted; but loving obedience to the Master of the table is given precedence over concepts of administration. Sacramentarian and memorialist alike may well kneel together in a great compulsion of love, each being persuaded in his own mind, and both finding peace and joy in a mystical union with the Lord of all. His table should be as free as the measureless love with which he hallowed it.

We can also remove the sectarian barrier to church membership. Not that such membership should be made less exacting. It has been made too easy already in some particulars. But the emphasis should be placed not upon acceptance of a creed or adherence to a form but upon the devotion of a life. We can remove in large measure the intellectual tests and the sectarian requirements that have held too prominent a place at the door

of the church. Movements in this direction are already well defined and growing in extent. Many churches are enlarging their doors by the gracious practice of "open membership." Others are modifying their creedal conditions. Increasingly the requirements of believing theories about Christ are being subordinated to a passionate belief in Christ himself and a living devotion to his way of life. Human theories either in theology or churchmanship are not primal in the kingdom of God; and the moral and spiritual sovereignty of Christ for men and nations should steadily become the supreme ideal for churches of every name and faith.

But note that these suggestions for the basis of a larger fellowship do not in any degree involve the abandonment of any ecclesiastical principles or creedal beliefs. It means only that these shall not impede access to the table of our Lord or condition entrance to his church. No compromises are suggested; no modification of sectarian position is implied; the proposal is simply that the beginning and growth of Christian experience should not be tested or colored by any denominational peculiarity or hindered by any sectarian concepts of faith. All elements not essential to salvation should be subordinated to the clear and undisputed commandments of Christ. And if this moratorium of divisive externals is supplemented by a continuing effort to increase mutual acquaintance and to cultivate a more intimate fellowship some real progress will surely be made in our approaches to unity.

At a recent church conference on unity held in Cheltenham, England, the bishop of Gloucester presided. Dr. Headlam was one of the leading spirits at Lausanne and is everywhere known as a churchman of distinguished ability and catholicity of spirit. His contributions to unity are far seeing and irenic. At Cheltenham the bishop is quoted as saying, "So far as I can see, no particular theory of the church and no form of church government can find any support, direct or indirect, in the teaching of our Lord."

But the achievement of an inclusive and abiding unity will require more than the negative processes of removing some of the external limitations that now hinder the free and generous intercommunion of Christian people. Organic unity will need a far reaching and more thorough method and will demand a patient and tireless devotion to the deeper and firmer foundations upon which alone the united church of Christ can be built. It is hardly probable that the older church leaders of this generation will be able to make those sacrificial renunciations necessary for the attainment of the unity we covet. But that which seems humanly impossible for our generation may become the practical certainty of the next generation if we of the present ordain that it should be so. The organic unity of the Protestant churches of Christ in America can be underwritten in our day if we will that those who immediately come after us should reap what we determine to sow.

The philosophy of history has revealed to us no greater equation of corporate power than this: that the thinking of one generation modifies the achievement of the next; that the intellectual concepts and emotional ideals inculcated in the youth of one generation come to realization in the generations immediately following.

Here is the most tremendous fact in the entire domain of social psychology. It is not yet well understood, nor is the limitless latent power of it appreciated. As stated in the formula above the full measure of its significance does not appear. But this supreme dynamic of social progress makes it entirely possible to change the beliefs, customs and activities of a people in one generation. Here is a demonstration of cause and effect on a mammoth scale. As one generation sows, the next one reaps. Our children's harvests will be of our planting.

Benjamin Kidd, the well known English exponent of social science, bears witness to this truth: "Given clear vision in the general mind, a cultural inheritance, utterly impossible as it might seem, could be imposed on civilization in a single generation." "There is not an existing institution in the world

of civilized humanity which cannot be profoundly modified or altered, or abolished in one generation." This is a strong statement; but it is true. Lacking proof one might well incline to regard it as the unverified theory of an academic mind. But history is not silent.

Forty years before the great war Dr. Adalbert Falk was the Prussian minister of education for the German empire. As a member of the Prussian autocracy he carried into the state schools of all Germany the dominating idea that German power was to conquer the world by force of arms. For a generation this nationalistic proposal was constantly drilled into the minds and impressed upon the hearts of German youth. Older men and women were neglected; their ideas were largely fixed. But upon the pliant minds and sensitive hearts of the boys and girls "*Deutschland ueber Alles*" was steadily impressed.

The outcome of this educational program for Prussianizing the German people through their youth needs no reporting. It has entered into history. Other illustrations come to mind. The issues of the American Revolution were determined far in advance of Lexington and Bunker Hill. It required only one generation to indoctrinate the north with the conviction that slavery was hopelessly wrong. Long before Fort Sumter was fired upon the doom of slavery had been underwritten through the pulpit, press, school, and home. The hedonistic riot that is now devastating our spiritual values is the inevitable result of that rampage of naturalistic thinking which too much characterized the educational programs of the generation before our own. Those who understand the voices of our American youth as they have gathered in council to pass judgment on the great issues of the day know that they have already decreed world peace; and the gates of militarism shall not prevail against it.

Here then is a certain way to unity. We may not attain unto it in our day. The average age of our ecclesiastical leaders renders improbable the achievement of organic unity in this generation. But youth, sensitive, impressionable, responsive to

radiant ideals and obedient to great visions — youth is in our hands for our molding. We may continue, if we dare, to bend their pliant minds and hearts to the ecclesiastical *status quo*; we may impose upon their fresh and unspoiled youth our sectarian divisions and denominational prejudices; we may make them like ourselves, and, God have mercy upon us, hold back the precious advancement of Christian unity for half a century. Here is our inescapable responsibility.

Rushing in where angels might fear to tread, I venture to propose that we make of our New England domain, a region where men have ever nurtured the holy habit of adventuring in new ways, a proving ground for setting forward the unity of all our churches. Here is an approach to unity that will not fail us; an endeavor that will find the path even if we ourselves are not permitted to follow it to the end.

Let us begin to instruct the Christian youth of all New England in the holy ideals and sacred compulsions of Christian unity. Let us forsake at once the emphasis of denominational doctrines and principles. Let us free their youthful spirits of all sectarian bondage to the dying past. Let us dare to make them the apostles of unity which we ought to have become. The machinery would be simple. A commission made up of leaders of every denomination might convene and agree upon a plan. Endorsement of a common program of education in unity could be made by each church at its annual state meeting. A system of instruction suited for our church schools could be provided. From the primary classes to the high school groups our boys and girls could be molded to our heart's desire, and the unity which we have failed to find would become their glorious achievement.

We need have no fear of youth. It is for us to remember that when God wished to reveal himself to the world he did not choose a patriarch as his medium of self-expression. Apollo hastening to greet the dawn is not more wonderful than that youthful Galilean who gave the sweetness and strength of his early years as a revelation of the eternally adventuring God.

And youth, ever facing forward, with hopes undimmed by the dust of the years, is at our hands. Youth, eager for high adventure, willing slaves of great compulsions; brave, daring, unfettered youth is at our hands for holy conquests in Christ's name. With high confidence we may teach them the sacred obligations of Christian unity. And the prayer of Jesus that has faltered on our own unworthy lips will find answer in the generations to come.

MORRIS H. TURK.

DREAMS

Say that we dream — our dreams have woven
Truths that outface the burning sun;
The lightnings that we dreamed have cloven
Time, space, and linked all lands in one.

Dreams? But their swift celestial fingers
Have knit the world with threads of steel,
Till no remotest island lingers
Outside the world's great commonweal.

Dreams, are they? But ye cannot stay them,
Or thrust the dawn back for one hour;
Truth, love and justice, if ye slay them,
Return with more than earthly power.

Strive if ye will to steal the fountains
That send the spring through leaf and spray;
Drive back the dawn from Eastern mountains,
Then bid this mightier movement stay.

It is the Dawn — the Dawn — the nations
From East to West have heard a cry —
Through all earth's blood-red generations
By hate and slaughter climbed thus high.

Here, on this height — still to aspire,
One only path remains untrod,
The path of love and peace climbs higher,
Make straight this highway for your God.

—*Alfred Noyes.*

PROGRESS TOWARD RELIGIOUS UNITY

BY REV. HENRY A. ATKINSON, D. D.
Secretary of the Church Peace Union, New York

RELIGION by its very definition binds men to God, but it seems to divide them from each other. The fatherhood of God is much easier to accept as an article of faith than the universal brotherhood of men, if one is to judge by practical results. The statement that the divisions of the Christian Church constitute the greatest scandal in Christendom has become a trite saying. The only hopeful sign is that there is to-day more than ever before a great yearning for unity on the part of spiritual men and women throughout the whole world. It is not, perhaps, too much to say that never since the time of the Reformation have so many serious, worth-while efforts been made to bring together the scattered forces and reconstitute an effective army capable of fighting against the mighty forces of evil, which to-day seem to be threatening civilization in all its organized forms, the state, the home, the church.

There is manifest throughout the world a disregard for the fundamental laws upon which our very civilization is built. A distinguished English visitor, after spending six months in America, was asked before embarking for home what impressed him more than anything else in the United States. His reply was prompt: "The almost complete disregard for law and the complacent attitude assumed toward the situation by the best people I have met in your country." In this respect America is not greatly different from other countries. There are more of us and more territory, and then Americans profess to put more confidence in the law and law courts than any other people. They are the foundation stones of our government.

I have used a military figure purposely, for the new interest in unity grows out of the feeling that the church and other

religious organizations must be made to function in behalf of social justice for a clearer appreciation of the ethics which lie at the foundation of our civilization; and for the betterment, the rationalizing and humanizing of international relations; else there can be little hope for any amelioration of conditions. In other words, the feeling after a larger degree of unity grows out of the necessities which the evils of our time force upon the attention of men and women. Theology will always have its place and it does matter what a man thinks, for in the long run we act as we think. Without entering into the discussion of that old question whether thought precedes action or action precedes thought, we are faced to-day with what Bishop McConnell calls "squaring ourselves with a God who believes in realities."

We in the West are constantly thinking of all our problems from a Western standpoint, and one of the most serious mistakes Christianity has made is to ignore the force and meaning of the other great religions of the world. There is a much larger problem outside of Christianity than there is within the circle of the Christian churches, but that larger problem includes the Christians, as well as the men and women of other faiths.

Is it possible to bring together representatives of all the religions and create a great world movement in behalf of the things in which religion is most vitally interested? If you mean by that to bring the religions into an official relationship with each other, the answer is "no." If you mean that there shall be created a great fellowship of faiths, each faith appointing its members and organizing that fellowship as a kind of an over-soul to the religions of the world, the answer is again "no." If you mean an effort to bring together representatives of these faiths and through agreement upon certain intellectual propositions, upon the facts of religion, the philosophical contents of our faiths and their ethical implications, the answer must be again "no." If you mean an effort to create a "synthetic" religion that will take out of each the things that are of major importance and leave the adherents of the faiths who will not

accept the new to go their way, while others will follow the new, again you must answer by a most emphatic "no."

But, if you mean that a body of the adherents of the world's religions should get together — men and women who believe that there is something fundamental in all religion that is essentially alike, and that it is possible to join hands in a forward advance against the foes that are common to each and all of our faiths,—then you must say "*yes*"; and the conference held in Geneva last September gives emphasis to this answer. Religion is the one human interest most nearly universal. Only about five persons out of every hundred are willing to write themselves down as being without any faith. The difficulty is to secure a practical interpretation of what that religion really means. Religion has been divisive and the cause of wars when it ought to bind men together.

As Sir Eric Drummond said, "With commerce, science, art, politics, and diplomacy coöperating on a world-wide scale, it would seem that religion, which is devoted to making a better world, could be organized for this high purpose." The conference held in Geneva grew out of the conviction that it was worth trying and that it could be done. The intention was to make it merely a committee meeting. The experience and encouragement led us to feel justified in calling together a number of eminent men and women to report to them our findings and explore with them the further possibilities in this field. We actually invited only eighty persons, representing the eleven living religions. So many requests were made by people who wanted to attend that ultimately we enrolled one hundred and ninety-one delegates. Among the world-renowned men present were Fridtjof Nansen, Sir Francis Younghusband, Yusuf Ali, Sir Willoughby Dickinson, Gilbert Murray, the maharajah of Burdwan; the grand rabbi of the British Empire; Theodore Reinach; Dr. Chen, head of the Confucians; Pavry, a Parsee; Mountfort Mills; Sir Denison Ross, head of the department of oriental studies of the University of London; C. F. Andrews, who came directly from India as a representative of Gandhi,

who was too ill to travel; among the Americans were Messrs. Cadman, Merrill, Mathews, Bishop McDowell and George A. Plimpton. John A. Lapp and Marc Sagnier spoke for the Roman Catholics, and the metropolitan of Warsaw for the Eastern churches. It was a colorful gathering. A careful reading of the entire list of members will impress anyone with its weight and the representative ability of those whose names are recorded. The Japanese Government, through its department of religions, sent three delegates — one Shinto, one Buddhist, one Christian — and paid all their expenses.

There was a remarkable unanimity in the ideals as expressed by the various delegates. The addresses showed an almost unanimous agreement among the great religions as to a common ultimate ideal. Universal brotherhood and world peace are of their very essence. But through misunderstanding and bad leadership, not to say bigotry and intolerance, some of the religions find themselves in deadly opposition to each other. This conference demonstrated that if we can find some great ideal and make it concrete enough to attract the interest and command their loyalty, all religions can be brought together. For the first time in the history of the world a religious conference on these lines has been held and it was a success.

We are definitely committed not to establish a formal league of religions. We are not seeking to bring together followers of the various faiths on the basis of the least common denominator of their faith, nor are we seeking to create a "synthetic" religion. We have no interest in philosophical, theological, or ecclesiastical questions. Our one purpose is to secure the co-operation of all the religions for the establishment of what, curiously enough, a Moslem, a Jew, a Confucian, and a Christian called, each in his address before the gathering — "the kingdom of God," defining in his own way this phrase as a state of world-wide fellowship and the abolition of war.

The purpose as agreed upon is to bring together in 1930 one thousand men and women, adherents of all the religions of the world, based on a fair numerical proportion of each faith.

This conference will probably be held in Geneva and the program will be based upon this question: "What can my religion contribute toward establishing world peace?" The message, written principally by Wickham Steed and agreed upon by the conference, expresses in a magnificent way the purpose and the firm determination of that remarkable group. The message reads:

"Peace is one of the loftiest positive aims of united human endeavor. Spiritual in its very nature, and implicit in the teachings of all religions, it was this aim which inspired the Church Peace Union to set on foot the movement that has now taken form in a resolve to hold a world conference of all religions. Of this conference the sole purpose will be to rouse and to direct the religious impulses of humanity against war in a constructive world-wide effort to achieve peace.

"A preliminary gathering was convened at Geneva in September, 1928, to consider the holding of a universal religious peace conference in 1930. To this gathering came men and women of all faiths from all parts of the earth. They were united in the conviction that the state of mankind to-day demands that all persons of good-will in every religion shall work together for peace; and that, more than ever, concerted religious effort is needed to attain it.

"Even as nations have been learning that no one of them suffices to itself alone, but that each needs to help and to be helped by others, so also the religions of the world will come to see that each must seek to serve and to be served in the work of peace, and to go hand in hand toward the common goal.

"Hence, it was resolved that a universal religious peace conference be held, to put in motion the joint spiritual resources of mankind; and that, without attempting to commit any religious body in any way, the conference consist of devoted individuals holding, or associated with, recognized forms of religious belief.

"The Universal Religious Peace Conference designs neither to set up a formal league of religions, nor to compare the relative values of faith, nor to espouse any political, ecclesiastical, or theological or social system. Its specific objects will be:

1. To state the highest teachings of each religion on peace and the causes of war.

2. To record the efforts of religious bodies in furtherance of peace.
3. To devise means by which men of all religious faiths may work together to remove existing obstacles to peace; to stimulate international coöperation for peace and the triumph of right; to secure international justice, to increase good-will and thus to bring about in all the world a fuller realization of the brotherhood of men.
4. To seek opportunities for concerted action among the adherents of all religions against the spirit of violence and the things that make for strife.

“Persuaded that this high purpose will move devoted hearts and minds everywhere, the preliminary gathering at Geneva has appointed a committee to prepare for the Universal Religious Peace Conference, so that world wide coördination of religious endeavor may help toward the full establishment of peace among men.”

War is not simply a menace to Christianity or to the West, nor are the causes of unrest confined to the Western world. There is a mighty giant in the East that is now beginning to stir out of his long sleep. He must be reckoned with for good or ill. If there is to be peace in the world, the physical and commercial unity of the world must be cemented by the common spiritual forces of mankind. The religions of the world are actually all very close together as they face their great tasks. It was an amazing thing at the Jerusalem Missionary Conference held last April, when the question of the world's religions was being discussed, to find that, according to the missionaries from the field, Confucians, Buddhists, Hindus, Moslems are all discussing the same fundamental question that we are discussing here in America — “How can we make our religion effective against the onslaught of secularism?” It was almost pathetic to hear our wise Chinese friend at Geneva in his quaint English, pleading with us to help protect the ancient faith of Confucius against the modern spirit of a secular civilization. If you had had a chance to be at the meeting at Geneva and heard five-sixths of the discussions and had not known, either

by language or by peculiarities in dress or type of feature, that there were nearly a dozen religions represented, you would have thought that this was a Christian meeting discussing common Christian problems relating to the work on the border of the ecclesiastical establishments.

Another fact that needs to be considered is this: the same struggle of progress against reaction, of fundamentalist against liberal, is dividing every church, every religion, just as it is dividing all our Christian churches. One of the Moslems, a representative of the Amadieh movement, said to me, "I shall be happy to give you letters to my friends in India and I will write to them, but you better ask Yusuf Ali to give you letters to other Moslem groups as well, for you know I am looked upon as a progressive and a radical and you will undoubtedly find many of my faith who think I am a dangerous person." It sounded very much like some of the difficulties with which we meet in America and Europe. Here is a new appeal; here is a new task for Christianity itself: "Is our Christianity big enough to enter whole-heartedly into a movement toward a larger religious unity such as is promised by this conference?"

One of the most interesting men I have met in many years was Dr. Theodore Reinach of the College of France. When I saw him before the conference in Geneva I found him a bit cynical. He was justly proud of the fact that many referred to him as the one man in France worthy to wear the mantle discarded in death by Anatole France. He attended the Geneva conference and made one of the most thoughtful and helpful speeches. In his death, which occurred in November, the world has lost a great soul as well as a great intellect. Reinach was one of the last men I saw before leaving the hall after the final session of the conference. He said to me, "I have dreamed sometimes of the unity of religions for some great humanitarian purpose but I never expected to see it. My dream seems to be coming true."

Here is an appeal to the emotions. If we can vitalize the knowledge we possess and put the emphasis upon this great

ideal that world brotherhood and universal peace is a task great enough to demand the complete allegiance of all our faiths and all the followers of our faiths, then a new and brighter day will dawn for humanity. If politicians can get together, is it too much to hope that religious minded folk throughout the world can do the same? Is Christianity big enough to enter into this enterprise without attempting to dominate it for its own ends?

It seems significant, in considering this question, that we should consider the method. Given a task big enough and all our petty differences will be lost sight of as we give ourselves to the task in hand. Every religion has claimed Jesus because in every undertaking his wisdom, his spirit, and his faith, when applied, are found to be of the greatest value in its accomplishment. To do away with war, to free the world from this ancient curse is a task great enough to command all the resources of humanity. If we can join together in this undertaking we will find that the spirit of each one of the great historic faiths is complimentary to the other, and through service we will come into the wider fields of a world-wide, recognized religious unity and, with it, war will become as impossible as would be the burning of witches in any educated community to-day throughout the whole world.

HENRY A. ATKINSON.

Hath man no second life?
Pitch this one high!
Sits there no judge in heaven our sin to see?
More strictly then the inward judge obey.
Was Christ a man like us?
Ah, let us try if we then, too, can be such men as he!

—*Matthew Arnold.*

THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF UNITY

BY REV. EDWARD SCRIBNER AMES, PH. D.

Professor of Philosophy, University of Chicago, Chicago

So much attention is given to the attainment of a more perfect unity in Christendom that the existing unity is often overlooked or minimized. It is also possible that the whole problem may be more successfully treated from the psychological approach rather than from the theological. A study of a local church of any denomination, in terms of the loyalties and activities of its members, might reveal the fact that their group attachments are far more human and practical than doctrinal or formal. Whatever creed a congregation professes, it is also a natural social unit permeated by the attitudes and ties which unite people who frequently meet together, engage in the same ceremonies, respond to the same leaders, and share the same emotions in tragic and joyful experiences.

It is certainly these immediate human relations which most impress the children of the church. I well remember my own impressions of the church in which my father was the minister when I was in the years from four to six. Sunday after Sunday I sat there with the family, heard the earnest hymns, listened to the prayers and sermons, and felt the genial warmth and Sunday cleanliness of that little flock. In their homes for Sunday dinners and in the church socials I received an impression, which I now feel vividly, of a comradeship, an ideal fellowship, which radiated through all the conversation and animated all members of the circle. While the sermons and fireside discussions were not understood, the glow of conviction was felt, and a sense of vastly important matters with which all were concerned. The faces of those men and women, lighted by their faith, and solemnly inquiring for wisdom and courage, made a picture of "our church" upon my mind which is deep

and lasting. Compared to this intimate, personal sense of participation, the feeling toward other churches of the town was remote and unmoving. The difference was not due to any feeling of their doctrinal differences, but simply to their strangeness. Any human being comes to feel more "at home" in the place and among the persons who have grown familiar by early and prolonged association. This fixing of attitudes in children is probably a more powerful influence in maintaining the morale of local churches and of denominations than has been recognized.

In all probability it is this intimate, social appeal which draws new members of older years into churches. Every one knows how powerful "personal work" is in recruiting congregations. Even the most emotional revivalists depend upon their personal workers to establish individual, vital contacts with those who are to be reached. Much depends upon the personality and social appeal of these workers. The institution employs a kind of courtship in wooing persons into its bosom, and for this purpose the attractiveness of the building, warmth of social life, the manner of the minister and leaders are of more importance than doctrines, creeds, ordinances, or arguments. There must of course be a fundamental religious idealism, an emphasis upon the central Christian spirit, an earnest and genuine conviction of devotion to a great and rewarding cause, in order to draw people into a church, but, beyond this, they are usually little interested in the distinctive doctrinal plea. Probably it has always been so, for theological discussions and appeals have been wrapt in this human, social setting.

Modern psychology has shown that human beings are much more susceptible to these influences than to direct intellectual formulations. Custom and usage, fashion and taste, are more persuasive than debate or information. Such is the basis, too, of antagonisms and divisions. All that binds a man in this way to his own class and party tends to keep him outside other groups. They feel alien and unsatisfying and are judged to be

inferior or wrong. Strange ways are easily thought to be evil, and strange people are dangerous; unfamiliar churches are liable to be regarded as lacking vital religion, just as new movements are felt to be irregular and heretical.

Denominations are just larger associations of local congregations and exhibit much the same basis of coherence. Individual churches are established by leaders who have been habituated to the accustomed forms of behavior, to the characteristic songs, texts, rituals, manners, and ideas. Not infrequently it is possible to see the influence in the shaping of religious movements of the political or economic forces with which they are interwoven. It is well known that the Nicean creed, which was so long the chief formula of Christianity, was adopted by a very close vote in a stormy council, called together by the Emperor Constantine to overcome the religious dissensions which weakened the unity of his kingdom. Thus the pattern of orthodoxy in the church was achieved as a political measure. If the history of all the denominations were rewritten with due regard for their economic, social, and political connections, there would be better understanding of the nature and sources of their differences. Lutheran, Calvinistic, Wesleyan, and Puritan movements had racial and national traits at their birth which persist with the inertia of great social streams, marked by cultural characteristics which flow on from generation to generation. The numerically most powerful bodies — Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, Lutheran — have grown and spread in environments congenial to them. Not their doctrines but their manner of behavior, their personalities, and their institutions have carried them on. They are united within themselves most of all by their traditions, their mores, their fitness to the level of the populations which respond to them. Their leaders, schools, philanthropies, journals, and the common spirit of Christianity which they share are the secrets of their strength.

The second fact of primary significance from the standpoint of social psychology is that the movements toward union

among these and other denominations are of the same human, neighborly kind which unite together the members of any one communion. The tendencies toward union are not due to a conscious and deliberate modification of doctrine, but to a growing acquaintance through practical interests. Social reforms, such as prohibition, woman's suffrage, battles with organized vice and graft, have forced into attention the possibilities of power through closer alliance. Therefore, federations of churches have arisen, and the Federal Council of Churches.

In smaller communities, and in newer suburban sections of large cities, community churches have sprung up for the purpose of providing religious privileges for the young, and to offer to the whole community the opportunity of religious fellowship. Not infrequently such union churches have been fostered by real estate firms who felt that a church would add to the attractiveness of the residential neighborhood. One of the commonest arguments for the community church is economic. Disregarding the traditional backgrounds of individual Christians, it is contended that it would be a saving to have one church for a town of a thousand inhabitants rather than to try to support three or four. The device which is the most ingenious I know for circumventing any possible scruples of individuals is that of a suburban church which has no membership of its own, technically, but requires those who participate in it to belong to some regularly organized church elsewhere in the city or country. In this way all are able to satisfy their denominational traditions and, at the same time, coöperate in the local assembly and services!

All such union movements have the effect of giving larger place to the natural proclivities for association in the human and practical aspects of religion without stressing the doctrinal and institutional claims of the past. Such enterprises may be said to arrive at their union measures by a flank movement with reference to the old orthodoxies. Those orthodoxies are not disproved, nor openly discarded, nor even consciously surrendered. They are just quietly and gently left one side, with

only casual hints here and there that matters of doctrine are not of central concern. Naturally it is most difficult for persons belonging to churches with a high doctrinal consciousness or with strongly developed ecclesiastical authority to surrender to the plea for local union churches on the free and natural basis of neighborly fellowship and thrift. In some form they are still influenced by an authoritarian conception of Christianity. Some ordinance, like baptism, or some claim of tradition, like apostolic succession, anchors their conscience to an exclusive fellowship. Within the local congregations of such authoritarian denominations these scruples are not powerful constructive forces, except as they may lend a certain feeling of superiority and exclusiveness.

In their actual appeal churches with these authoritarian survivals operate very much as other churches, that is, by their social, æsthetic, and practical attractiveness. They do not insist upon their converts believing in the efficacy of baptism or the historic episcopate, so long as they are willing to accept these in practice. It is now a common experience that persons who, on social or practical grounds, wish to unite with a church which practices immersion, will be received and baptized although openly insisting that they do not see the importance of it but are willing to conform to the custom of the congregation. Doubtless many members of liturgical churches still continue to recite the creeds in conformity to the group habit, although unable deliberately and wholeheartedly to give assent to the phrases one by one. Many things are sung or intoned which would not be thoughtfully asserted. But even where the rank and file of members may indulge in many mental reservations, the institution may maintain insistence upon exclusiveness and refuse to countenance participation in union meetings or in organized efforts among the churches of a community.

The third point of this article is that since the unity of local congregations throughout the history of churches has been essentially a matter of association, of comradeship, and of practical activities; and since the tendencies toward union through

group movements is due to neighborhood conditions as in community churches, or to civic and national problems as in the Federal Council of Churches and their local federations, it is important to see the whole question of Christian unity at the present time in terms of these powerful forces and the new religious philosophies of life which they imply. It should be obvious by this time that unity upon an authoritarian, doctrinal basis is absolutely impossible. The history of all such efforts is evidence that attempts at such unity only beget divisions, or suppression. It is no secret that the great ecclesiastical systems, which endeavor to present a united front to the world are in reality disturbed within by many parties, by differences of races and cultures, by tendencies to modernism and by individual dissenters and innovators. Besides, the whole current of modern scientific thought and democratic practice is in the direction of greater freedom for the individual, and toward social experimentation and diversity of group organization. It may well be that the future of creative religious enterprises lies with local churches of great variety of doctrine and ritual, loosely affiliated with other congregations in the interest of great cultural and humanitarian objectives.

As illustrative of what such a development might be, I wish to cite some facts with reference to many existing local congregations more or less identified with conventional denominations. It is not an uncommon thing for a Congregational, Methodist, Presbyterian, or Episcopalian church to have within its membership persons who have come from a dozen or twenty different denominations. Changes of membership are brought about by marriage, by shifts of residence, by business and personal association, by social and æsthetic interests. There is no longer any "pure" denomination any more than there is a pure race. What is more significant is that people make these changes from one body to another without much questioning or hesitation when some real practical need arises. The churches accept all individuals who wish to be associated in groups which cherish the values of the Christian tradition, without insistence

upon the technicalities of forms of doctrine or vivid personal experience. A few ministers and congregations consciously and openly avow this policy and this practice is rapidly spreading. In my judgment this is the promising and fruitful method of promoting Christian union.

Organic union between constituted ecclesiastical bodies appears increasingly to be a vain hope, and, if effected, would threaten the return of authoritarian religion with all of its old repressions and bigotry. What is needed is greater freedom of attitudes and beliefs, and more latitude for experimentation and adaptation to new ideas and methods of work. All conferences between representatives of differing denominations and divergent faiths have great value. They aid in mutual acquaintance and understanding; they bring into the foreground the vital and dynamic forces of religion and disclose the basic and significant ideals and aspirations of the human heart. In this way they loosen the old dogmatisms, overcome the surviving provincialisms, and expose the petty things of exclusive sects. They magnify the things commonly believed among us and reveal the potential power of large and free associations of vast numbers of people and institutions when banded together for practical religious ends. Their most significant effect is in permeating local congregations with the spirit of tolerance and hospitality toward the individuals of their communities who might be drawn into religious fellowship upon broader and more essentially Christian attitudes. At last the real achievement of union is a work for local churches without the interference of overhead dictatorship, whether from ecclesiastical officials, society secretaries, religious journals, or opinionated elders and deacons.

The final task of Christian union is, therefore, the task of local congregations. Some of them are performing it timidly and only half-consciously. A few are working at it openly and with clear perception of its import and significance. They designate their procedure as open-membership, or inclusive membership. All community churches are essentially of this

character, and also all denominational churches which have relinquished insistence upon exclusive conditions of membership. Many Baptist churches receive persons without immersion, Episcopal churches accept individuals regardless of literal subscription to the creed, Methodist churches do not insist upon any peculiar method, nor Presbyterian churches upon adherence to the form of the presbytery.

In this way, while local groups may still continue their allegiance to denominational systems for missionary and benevolent work, the attachment is largely practical, with less and less emphasis upon doctrine or any special scheme of salvation. Individuals move freely from one body to another with changes of residence, or in response to the personal appeal of ministers or friends, or in search for better forms of worship or methods of social and humanitarian work. Local congregations are thus becoming freer voluntary associations of people who are in quest of the four fundamental things which are the true functions of vital churches; namely, public services for the dramatizations of the moral and religious values of life; instruction for children and adults in the expanding cultural life of the world; social contacts for the satisfaction of the friendly and recreational needs of human nature; and methods of association for the promotion of the radiating and expansive spirit of missionary enterprises and social reforms. Whoever seeks fellowship in churches for such ends is thereby regarded as qualified for participation within the fold of the Christian faith. The greatest possible contribution to the cause of union is made by churches motivated and directed by such ideals.

There is no more genuine or satisfying unity than this. Many of the attempts to unite local congregations under one roof proceed from the old and impossible motivations of seeking to make the faith visible in outward conformity and institutional structure. Not infrequently, worldly pride in bigness and in mere prestige of numbers and wealth influences experiments in combining local churches. This tendency in

religion is often a reflection of industrial and economic interests which may be inimical to vital religion when made the standard of the churches. There is certainly no guarantee that a big church is a vital church; nor is there any assurance that a community is better served by one or two religious organizations than by six or a dozen. A church of twenty members may be more stimulating to its individual members and a better witness to the things of a spiritual faith than one of a thousand members. Everything depends upon the spirit and attitude. A large body may suppress individuals or fail to develop their possibilities. The craving for institutional efficiency may thwart all experimentation and adventurous novelty. It has been the bane of churches and of other established institutions that they have often become more concerned with the smooth working of their customary machinery than with experiments for improvement through untried ideas and procedures.

A church only rises to the fullest and most fruitful life when it includes within itself widely diverse types of people and growing ideas for meeting the pressing problems of living experience. No practice of union is adequate to an expansive life which does not consciously recognize that there should be provision and encouragement for inquiry, for experiment, for discussion of differences, for pious doubt and for serious adventure in new undertakings and methods. The proof that such union is possible in religion may be found in various social institutions in modern society. Associations for the advancement of science for example, afford such proof. In them men unite in kindly comradeship for the very purpose of pushing their enterprises out into new realms. They propound new theories, report new experiments and discoveries, criticize one another's theories and technique in mutual good-will, in the interest of extending the field of their science. Uniformity of thought, or conformity to established procedure is not required. Only reasonable methods, determined in the light of a working body of principles, and particularly in the light of results, are

required to admit persons to the circles of scientists. They are not required to believe in matter, or evolution, or the law of cause and effect though most of them may do so. All that is necessary is that they should be intelligent concerning the problems in hand and show by their attitude and behavior that they are seriously in search of better and more fruitful methods, and that what they claim to be better methods really show themselves to be such by their results. Such groups are stimulating, innovating, expansive, and constructive, and they possess the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace.

It is of course impossible to deny that such a conception of unity implies a definite view of religion and of the Christian religion. On the old idea of a revealed religion, with an authoritative Bible or an authoritative officary in the church, it was natural to demand submission and conformity. There was then no problem for men to determine what to believe or do, at least not beyond ascertaining what the authority declared. But that conception of religion belongs to the past and is not compatible with present-day knowledge. To-day religion is seen, in the light of a long historical perspective and by the evidence of psychology, to be a phase of the general cultural life of the race. It grows with that culture and cannot make a vital appeal to modern minds if it insists upon claims to other sources and standards. Therefore, it is subject to the same processes of criticism, experimentation, and reconstruction as are politics, science, and art. The old kind of unity, long sought but never achieved, regarded all such attitudes as dangerous and subversive of the faith. Consequently, that kind of unity has no place in the modern world even as an ideal. It has everywhere proved itself divisive, bloody, and futile. The only hope of unity in the churches of this present world is a fundamentally different kind of unity,—a unity which is compatible with change, with innovation and with social transformations of a radical sort. This unity is a unity of spirit, of comradeship, and good-will in a continuing search and quest for the good life. It is often expressed as unity in the Spirit of Christ. The

religious world is gaining new loyalty to Jesus not by conceiving him as a law-giver but as an exemplar of love, as a devotee of social justice and of spiritual idealism. As a champion of the infinite value and dignity of human life, and as a martyr to his love of the least of these his fellow men, he still leads the hope and the faith of mankind toward the achievement of a heaven of brotherly love on earth. He asserted that his mission was to help men to a more abundant life, and his great apostle Paul besought his followers to stand fast in the liberty with which Christ set them free.

The task of making this freedom real and concrete in the world is the task of his followers, or the groups or churches of believers in his Spirit and his ideals. He gave no ready made program for its accomplishment, he laid down no laws or constitution for its realization beyond the spirit and the law of love itself. The only resource for his followers is, therefore, the experimental effort to find out through experience the methods and modes of life which most surely fulfill that law of love. It is the restless and ceaseless search for such methods which stirs in the hearts of Christians to-day, and it is this unfailing desire which projects new religious enterprises, new teaching, and new churches. The great need for advocates of union is to appreciate this fact and what it involves, and to reverently and boldly follow its demands. Experiment and adventure, in the direction which such ideals suggest, are more important than the formal and external unity which has proved vain and unattainable. Unless some kind of unity can be realized in the midst of growth and change there is no unity possible, for growth and change are evidently the destiny of all human interests.

If the foregoing observations are valid, we are brought to the seemingly paradoxical and startling conclusion that the kind of unity which is possible and desirable is to be found actualized to-day in liberal Protestantism more than anywhere else in the religious world. Roman Catholicism is the conspicuous illustration of authoritarian unity, but it is secured at the

cost of refusing to share in the contemporaneous life of the world. With all its greatness and power, the Catholic Church belongs to the ancient and the medieval order. It cannot tolerate the scientific and democratic attitudes. In the face of science it remains dogmatic, and in the midst of democracy it continues to be autocratic and despotic. The churches of liberal Protestantism, on the contrary, are open to the new learning. Their leaders are trained in the most advanced universities, they accept the enlightenment of historical knowledge, and the discoveries which have set man in a new relation to nature. They are reinterpreting the religious experience of mankind with the aid of new sciences and are employing experimental methods of religious education and of moral regeneration. There are obvious differences in their beliefs, practices, and forms of discourse, yet these liberals are conscious of a unity of spirit and of attitude in the search for truth and for efficient methods which draws them together across all distances of denominational names and traditions. It is frequently observed that the liberal men of all denominations feel closer to liberal men of other groups than they do to the conservative members of their own households. In their conferences and conversations it is evident, too, that in the conduct of their churches they are establishing the same temper and outlook among the laymen. The result is the development of an increasing number of undenominational churches within the fading lines of the old communions. It is only necessary to look below the surface differences of names and superficial forms to see this emerging pattern of a new unity of the Spirit. In this may be seen the prophecy of still better things to come.

At the present time it may well be the duty of ministers and laymen alike to consciously foster this free, experimental, constructive attitude; to proclaim it to their friends and to their public; and to dramatize and magnify this unity as a present actual possession of local congregations and of neighborhoods blessed by the growing coöperation of their various churches. Let the churches frankly say that they regard them-

selves as schools regard each other, all of them being set for the same ends of enlightenment and progressive discovery of better methods and more abundant results. Let them tell individuals to find their place in some church, whatever it may be, where they will receive and be able to contribute the greatest possible help in the fulfilment of the highest life for themselves and others. Let churches, like schools and other social agencies, admit that they possess no magic of inheritance, or ordinances, or esoteric doctrine, and that they must be judged by their atmosphere, their ideas, and their ministrations to the diverse needs of man's spiritual nature. By such attitudes, the fittest churches will survive, and those which survive will be of one large faith and one triumphant spirit.

EDWARD SCRIBNER AMES.

THE INDWELLING SPIRIT

Indwelling Spirit in the soul of man,
Most potent influence in life's great plan,
Urging expression in honest good-will,
Demanding service and sacrifice till
Self-love is outgrown at the Spirit's call
To a love higher and enfolding all;
Then we can accept what the world calls gain
As costly loss worth no zeal to attain;
Only the gifts of the Spirit endure,
And fruits of love and faith ever are sure,
O Lord of Life — inner Spirit of grace,
Make man's heart fit to be thy dwelling place.

—Gertrude B. Walker.

DIFFICULTIES IN THE WAY OF CHRISTIAN UNITY

BY REV. SAMUEL HARKNESS, D. D.

Minister Immanuel Presbyterian Church, Kansas City, Mo.

I DISTRIBUTED paper and pencils to the eighty people who were at the prayer meeting of my church one evening last winter and asked the following questions:

What is your religious background? Name the church of your parents, and any subsequent change or changes you have made as an adult from one denomination to another. Why did you change — was it a matter of convenience or conviction?

The majority was reared in the Methodist church, although a number came from the Baptists, Disciples and Congregationalists. The Dunkards, Unitarians, Catholics, United Brethren and Lutherans were also represented.

Convenience, enjoyment of the ministry of the church, and appreciation of the friendly nature of the people seemed to be the main reasons for crossing the denominational line. A number had crossed several lines. One left the Methodists and became a Presbyterian through conviction and two admitted that marriage had made Presbyterians out of them.

To the question, Would you now be willing to give up your denomination and belong to a community, federated, or independent church? the answers were all affirmative.

To the question, Would you be willing to go with your denomination into some general coöperative movement of Protestantism? again the answers were all "Yes."

But this question was answered in many ways: Are there any denominations with which you would refuse to unite? Name them and give the reason for your refusal. The refusal to unite with the Christian Scientists was general, seventy out

of eighty in fact. The reasons given simmer down to these: the Scientists have a material view of life and an illogical attitude toward medicine and surgery. One person wrote, "They are as far away from us as Catholics." The Unity School of Christianity was also generally excluded for an unworthy attitude toward prayer. Half a dozen ruled out the Unitarians. Twenty excluded all types of denominations which might be classed as "super-emotional," to use the phrasing of one answer. It is significant, however, that no barriers were raised against the historic and, to use the illuminating word of one answer, "standard" denominations.

The answers to this question, What creedal reservations would you make? amazed me. I particularized this matter of creedal reservations in the following manner: Do you insist on any particular form of baptism? One specified sprinkling, and the rest thought that the form should be a matter of individual choice. The manner of administering the Lord's supper also could be suited to various groups within a union of churches, it was thought. In answer to the question, Would you insist on the retention of baptism and the Lord's supper as sacraments? the general disposition was to retain the Lord's supper as such, but not baptism. Many, however, would not insist on the retention of either. I then asked, Would you ask, as a doctrinal basis of union, an expression like the Apostles' Creed (it was then repeated that all might weigh its affirmations) or would you be satisfied with a general statement of purpose under the leadership and Spirit of Jesus? Two voted for the Apostles' Creed, and the rest voted for the general statement. The Bible, as "the only infallible rule for faith and practice," was generally affirmed with qualifications like these: "Yes, but not a literal interpretation of all passages," and "Yes, but I believe the Bible, properly interpreted, sheds light on all subsequently discovered truth."

The final question was this: Is the present denominationalized system justified on an economic basis? The answer was unanimously "no." On an intellectual basis? Two thought so,

but the rest said "no." Justified by the Spirit of Christ? Again the answers were unanimously "no."

Those present constituted one-tenth of the membership of Immanuel Presbyterian Church, Kansas City, and a fair cross-section of our church life. Those of distinctly Presbyterian heritage were markedly liberal in their answers. The attitude of the meeting was earnest and thoughtful throughout. This survey indicates that difficulties in the way of Christian unity do not sit in the pews. The average church member is weary of denomination. Creedal idiosyncrasies bore and leave him cold. He is tired of paying the bills of competitive religion. He wants a better church with better preaching. And when he turns to the seventeenth chapter of John, he finds the highest authority for Christian unity.

Now it would be manifestly impossible to get eighty preachers with varying religious backgrounds to respond to the questions I submitted to eighty of my people with any degree of unanimity. I could start a riot in the ministers' alliance any time with such a survey. I believe that the ministers are the chief difficulties in the way of Christian unity. Nor are they wholly to blame. Their training was wrong. Their study of comparative religions was too condescending. They viewed other sects through the lorgnette of sour contempt. A friend of mine who is a priest in the Roman Catholic Church said to me recently, "When I think of the descriptions of my faith in the Protestant books of theology, I see red." I was reared to believe that an immersionist of any sort, and a "Campbellite" in particular, was a nuisance. On the other hand, I was taught to shun the Episcopalian, always a questionable person. It takes time to shake off these idiocies.

But deeper than any denominational line is the distinction between those who exalt the letter of creedal law and those who believe that it is the privilege of the believer in every age to go back for himself to the Jesus of the New Testament and say, "Who art thou, Lord?" All questions of polity and foreign missionary program are capable of adjustment, but until we

can learn the meaning of tolerance within our own communions as they now stand, we are not ready for wider inclusions. Both fundamentalists and modernists are to blame for this miserable condition which has vitiated the strength of great denominations at a time of unparalleled need and consequent opportunity. The fundamentalist, with his own prayer-clique and "black-list" of liberal preachers, is no worse than the supercilious modernist, tearing down the traditions of faith with nothing constructive to offer in their place, and with one eye, meanwhile, on the newspapers.

The way for us to get Christian unity is to become Christian. And our distance from that goal may accurately measure the distance we are from each other. We do not have to think alike, nor can we ever think alike. But we can follow Christ as our Lord and Master and trust each other.

Great issues are wrapped up in this ideal of Christian unity. The life of Protestantism, for instance, is at stake. The pressure of present failure is upon us. If we delay for another generation, we will have nothing to unite. Individual churches are so concerned with raising enough money to finance their work that they have no time for contemplation of their tasks. A church of 800 members with all bills paid is the ecclesiastic's paradise, but to the throbbing community it is just another church. Additional members are sought. A few extra subscriptions to the budget will help. We try to keep these considerations apart, but together they will go. Congregations are not easy to secure. Diversions are too many. And those who come must be coddled along with expensive advertising and elaborate music. If you could sit in the average board meeting of the average church, you might wonder if Jesus provisioned the strain and burden of things on an organization primarily intended to promote the life of the Spirit.

The denominations in the United States of America increased from forty million members to fifty-two million from 1916 to 1926, according to a recent report of the Federal department of commerce. But the average attendance of the Sunday

services is only thirty to thirty-five percent of the church membership. More members are absent from any given service than are present. Is this the proof of a healthy Protestantism under the denominational system?

Benevolent gifts, as reported in the official year books of denominations, are swelled by counting the private contributions of individuals to educational institutions, temperance organizations, and other charities. That these monies are given by church members does not alter the fact that they do not pass through the hands of the church treasurer. Without pressing the attitude of reputable business men toward such a practice, may we not consider whether the churches can afford to deceive themselves and others as to their financial activities?

Even as the country church has almost disappeared from the crossroads, so now the city church is being submerged by the changing population of districts, the pressure of economic inadequacy, and the contrary lure of amusements.

Many a church that is regarded as "one of our leading churches" in the denomination lets the coal bill and advertising charge run far beyond the traditional "thirty days." Decoration of the auditorium is "put over for another year." The empty pews are in the majority at every service. We have sung for many years:

"Like a mighty army moves the church of God,"

but we might more truthfully parody the great hymn:

Like a mighty army moves the un-churched host
While the church of Jesus, like a pallid ghost,
Seeks some recognition in the lives of those
Who are blandly careless where his banner goes.

And with the gradual decadence of Protestant influence there comes a swift decadence of moral standards. Vulgarity is less timid. The passion for acquisition is more ruthless. And the idea of God as a loving Father fades with the swift recession of a winter sunset.

The difficulties in the way of Christian unity cannot be so great as the tragedy of a defeated church and a betrayed Christ.

SAMUEL HARKNESS.

OHIO'S CHRISTIAN UNITY PROGRAM FOR 1930

BY VINTON E. McVICKER

Publicity Director of the Ohio Council of Churches, Columbus, Ohio

OHIO, which has won renown in recent years for its highly developed statewide program of interdenominational coöperation, carried on through the agency of the Ohio Council of Churches, is now laying plans for widespread activity in behalf of Christian unity in 1930, in harmony with the worldwide observance of the Pentecostal anniversary that year.

Announcement of the projected observance was made at the tenth annual Ohio Pastors' Convention in Columbus in January, in which nearly one thousand Protestant clergymen of twenty denominations enrolled. The present year will be devoted by the Ohio Council of Churches very largely to preliminary arrangements for the Christian unity program.

The starting point of the 1930 observance, and the phase of it to which most of the preliminary attention has thus far been given, will be the eleventh annual Ohio Pastors' Convention, to be held in Columbus the week of January 19, 1930. This will be accompanied in the same week by a statewide convention of laymen and a similar gathering of women of all the Protestant denominations. Small conferences of laymen and women were held this year during the Pastors' Convention period, but it is expected that these sessions next year will be on a much larger scale. Plans are being worked out for the Pastors' Convention also which are believed likely to bring its enrollment up to a total of more than two thousand (there are approximately 4,500 Protestant ministers in Ohio).

"Christian unity" is the central theme announced for all of these gatherings. All subjects considered in discussions and addresses will be approached from that standpoint, and an

attempt will be made to visualize a church and a world characterized by a spirit and practice of unity among Christians. The habit of searching discussion and fearless facing of vital questions has been highly developed among Ohio ministers in their state pastors' conventions of past years, and persons familiar with these gatherings are confident that far-reaching pronouncements on the subject of Christian unity will issue from the 1930 sessions.

The 1929 Ohio Pastors' Convention has already gone on record with a statement expressing its conviction "that the many divisions found in Protestantism are not in accordance with the will of the Master" and "that unity among all Protestant denominations is the ultimate goal in building the kingdom of God."

To further this ideal and to prepare the way for earnest intelligent consideration of Christian unity in 1930, this year's convention also provided for a special commission of seven members to study the subject and report to the 1930 body, and for the immediate launching of a program of united activities to be set forth for the churches month by month in the interest of unity.

The 1929 Pastors' Convention's complete findings on "inter-denominational good-will," which contained these provisions, are as follows:

"We recognize slight difficulties to organic Christian union in inherited traditions and customs, property rights and ecclesiastical machinery, but we wish to urge a going forward with community and general programs of work in every way possible with an unquestioning trust in the leadership of the Spirit to solve the problems as they arise.

"Ultimate union is the ideal and aim of Christians because it is clearly the will of the Master. The task of reaching the unchurched which he committed to his followers, the overcoming of organized evil in society, effecting economy in administration and avoidance of duplication of effort all call for a united church.

"Believing that unity among all Protestant denominations is the ultimate goal in building the kingdom of God, we, there-

fore, approve most heartily the trend toward unity not only in families of denominations, but also in all denominations that are alike in spirit and similar in organization, still looking to that perfect consummation when we shall all be one as our Lord willed and prayed.

"We request the executive committee of the convention to appoint a special commission of seven to survey the whole field of Christian unity movements, both local and general, up to the present time, adding such observations and recommendations as this study seems to make appropriate, and to report to the 1930 convention.

"We further confer upon the commission on interdenominational good-will for the coming year, the educational function of suggesting each month through *The Ohio Christian News*, a program for the month for the improvement of both mind and heart toward Christian unity. This program is to include suggestions of helpful bibliography, prayer meeting topics, a concert of sermons at Whitsuntide, the printing in pamphlet form of the hymns on Christian unity used in this year's convention, promoting study by city and county ministerial associations, and such other features as may seem to them wise."

Dr. William Oxley Thompson, president emeritus of Ohio State University, first president of the Ohio Council of Churches, and former moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, has accepted the chairmanship of the Pastors' Convention for 1930. Dr. Thompson was chairman of the special committee in charge of arrangements for the program of the recent quadrennial meeting of the Federal Council of Churches in Rochester. For the past two years he has presided at the united communion service which has come to be a central feature of the annual Ohio Pastors' Convention. This service will again be given a prominent place on the 1930 convention program, will be even more impressive than at previous conventions by reason of the large number of laymen who will join with the clergymen for the observance.

At both the 1928 and 1929 conventions the communion service, conducted with dignity and impressive ritual, has been the crowning event of the week in the estimation of most par-

ticipants, symbolizing as it does the essential unity of spirit prevailing among a body of Christian ministers of a score or more of communions. It will assume special significance next year, coming at the climax of a convention entirely devoted to a search after means of making this spirit of unity more truly effective in the life of the church.

A pageant depicting the history of the Christian church — its rise and early growth, its divisions and re-divisions following the Reformation and finally the present day movements toward coöperation and reunion of the scattered elements — will be an important feature of the convention week, if hopes of the Ohio leaders are realized. This is being projected on a scale that will attract nation-wide attention, and it will probably be offered on several nights during the convention period. Concerts by several famous musical organizations will also be arranged according to tentative plans. By these methods of utilizing the fine arts in behalf of Christian unity, those in charge of the arrangements hope to carry the message to many thousands of Ohio people who will be attracted to Columbus.

For the convention program proper, it is expected that an array of speakers will be secured who will be even more notable than those who have been offered at the ten conventions of preceding years. Christian leaders from Europe will be included, and efforts will be made to secure distinguished representatives of the United Church of Canada to bring the story of the practical operation of Christian union in their country. Eminent statesmen and religious leaders of the United States will be enlisted also.

An important and attractive feature of the Ohio Pastors' Convention in recent years has been the policy of dividing it during the two half-day sessions into sections assigned to specific topics. These groups are small enough to permit free and open discussion, giving every minister enrolled an opportunity to participate actively in formulating findings, which are later laid before the main body of the convention for ratification. In this manner at the 1929 convention, for example,

significant and timely pronouncements were drafted with regard to nine major subjects: International good-will, evangelism, religious education, interdenominational good-will, interracial good-will, moral welfare in the home, industrial good-will, the youth community, and the town and country church. The same general plan will be followed in 1930, except that the topics and discussion outlines assigned to the various groups will all have a direct relation to the convention's central theme of Christian unity. In the preliminary discussion of the program, the following questions have been proposed as typical of those which ought to be formulated as a guide for the various sections:

"What effect would Christian unity have upon the number and quality of Christian colleges?

"What effect would Christian unity have upon the number of ecclesiastical officials needed to supervise church work in any given area?

"What effect would Christian unity have upon the amount of money available for missionary and educational purposes?

"What effect would Christian unity have upon the number of interdenominational agencies?

"What effect would Christian unity have upon the pastor—his salary? his opportunities? his work? his growth and developments?"

In similar manner discussions of concrete problems of Christian union are being arranged for interdenominational group meetings, composed of pastors of denominations which are mutually considering union proposals or which are so nearly related that union seems to be a logical step. Methodist Episcopal and Presbyterian pastors will gather in a joint session, for example, to consider the significance and the practical aspects of the pending proposal for merger of those denominations. Disciples and Baptists will join in a similar conference.

These group meetings will carry still further the process of developing close acquaintance among Ohio pastors across

denominational lines, which has been a characteristic of past Ohio Pastors' conventions. Coming together in this convention year after year, working together in behalf of many common interests, the influential Protestant clergymen of the state have acquired a strong consciousness of common ideals and purposes that are shared by the entire body of Protestant clergy, irrespective of denomination. From this community of interest and aim that has developed through the years, it was a natural step forward to the expression of a desire for a higher degree of actual organic union, such as was voiced by this year's convention. The joint sessions to consider specific union projects will afford an opportunity to turn that desire into channels of definite accomplishment.

By the spontaneous demand of pastors themselves, a beginning was made this year in the holding of interdenominational group meetings to discuss union proposals. Leaders of the United Brethren, the Reformed Church in the United States, and the Evangelical Synod asked that in the period allotted in the convention program for separate denominational group luncheons they be authorized to arrange an interdenominational session instead of three distinct luncheons. This program was carried out, President George W. Richards of the Reformed Theological Seminary at Lancaster, Pa., was secured as a speaker, and the two hundred ministers present unanimously adopted a resolution favoring the organic union of their three denominations. In similar fashion, the men of the Christian and Congregational Churches, whose union is nearing consummation, also held a joint luncheon.

Most of the thought and planning thus far in preparation for 1930 have been directed toward the Pastors' Convention in January and the accompanying laymen's and women's meetings. However, it is not the thought of leaders in the Ohio Council of Churches that the convention itself is the ultimate goal. The convention week is counted upon rather to give the initial impetus to a statewide program of education in regard to Christian unity, which shall be carried into every county in the

state under the leadership of a local committee and of pastors who have been fired with enthusiasm and equipped with information at the convention. A large number of local united communion services, for example, are projected as one expression of this widespread interest. So also are evangelistic programs in which the church shall be interpreted to the community as one united body rather than as a number of divided, competitive units.

A vast amount of detail in this 1930 program remains to be worked out in the next few months. The ability of the Ohio Council of Churches to organize a significant and effective program, however, may be taken for granted in view of the steadily increasing success of the Ohio Pastors' Convention year after year. This gathering is unique in the religious life of America, and has served as both a creator and an expression of the spirit of coöperation which is characteristic of the Protestant churches of Ohio.

Filled with this spirit of coöperation and unity, the ministers of Ohio may be counted upon to respond with enthusiasm to the Christian unity program projected for 1930. They will gather in great numbers for the convention in January and they will go home filled with zeal for the program, which will enable them to transmit a large share of their enthusiasm to the laymen of the churches. The result will be a year of unprecedented study and discussion of Christian unity and the many related issues, and the development of a vast amount of sentiment in the state, which will lend strength to any movement for breaking down the barriers that now divide and weaken Protestantism.

VINTON E. McVICKER.

FINDINGS OF THE MIDWEST CONFERENCE ON CHRISTIAN UNITY

KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

JANUARY 16-17, 1929

I.

The Midwest Conference of the Christian Unity League, in Kansas City, Missouri, with Christians enrolled from twelve denominations and five states, affirms at the outset its acceptance of Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior, and its conviction that the unity his church must seek should be based on nothing less and nothing else than loyalty to his ideals of individual and social life. All appeals to the New Testament as a guide either in personal religion, institutional practice, or social ideals should be made in the light of modern historical scholarship.

II.

The conference commends for careful study by all churches the complete record of the World Conference on Faith and Order in Lausanne, 1927, as now available in book form. It hopes to see an increasing number of regional conferences throughout the world for the consideration of the union of the church of Christ, pending the arrangement in due time of another world conference like the one at Lausanne.

III.

The conference regards the community church movement in the United States, including more than 1,600 churches, as one of the significant movements in the Protestant world to-day, and believes that it should occupy an important place in any Christian unity conference. Community churches are a practical demonstration of the possibility of achieving Christian union. We urge denominational officials and ministers to coöperate sympathetically with community churches and their leaders, believing that in every case where the people of a community desire such a church they should be encouraged in every possible way by present religious organizations, and we deplore any tendency of the community church toward becoming another denomination. We believe that the religious life of rural communities especially depends upon a united church, and that the community church seems to be one of the best answers at present to this need. We recognize that many leading churches, denominational in name, are

really community churches in spirit and practice. Their denominational bonds grow more and more tenuous and their universal appeal more and more strong.

IV.

The conference believes that wherever two or more churches are at work in a community, with a clear right, there ought to be a church federation or council to express their fellowship in the gospel of Christ. Only so can churches measure up to their opportunities of serving their communities. The churches cannot adequately express the Christian attitude on the social problems of the world unless they are at least federated. Therefore, we commend the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the national federation of Protestant churches, for making as one of its major objectives in the next four years the more adequate supervision of the state and city federations already in existence and the extension of the practice of coöperative action. Granted that federation is less than unity, we believe that Christian unity will be promoted by the development of the federation movement. Lest the idea of federation, with its recognition of denominationalism, be accepted as a substitute for the idea of unity, we emphasize the value of frequent independent conferences of Christian leaders where the spirit of unity may find freer expression in a unity of spirit.

V.

The conference observes with satisfaction the interdenominational trend in Christian education. The training of large numbers of ministers and missionaries in union schools of religion is one of the most important factors in the development of the spirit of unity. We commend especially the development of union schools of religion in affiliation with state universities, which in some cases represent the coöperation of Jews and Catholics as well as Protestants.

We note with approval the trend toward the development of smaller educational units within the larger universities, believing that the small college has a place in our educational system; but we cannot find any hope for the denominational small college except along the line of readjustment upon an interdenominational basis. Valuable equipment and precious traditions in such colleges are in jeopardy unless such a reorganization for broad Christian training is made.

We are delighted with signs among the churches of placing the child in the midst. The churches should stress an educational program based upon the interests of children, with highly prepared leadership and with reasonably compensated teaching staffs, for we believe that the recentering of the institutional interests of religion in the spiritual culture of the young

is destined to be one of the strongest contributing factors in the development of Christian unity.

VI.

The conference believes that in the promotion of Christianity among non-Christian peoples and in non-Christian areas of conduct, the gospel of Jesus should be interpreted in its simplicity, with emphasis on the reproduction of the mind and spirit of Jesus, and that denominational differences of interpretation should be minimized if not completely eliminated. The churches engaged in missionary work should at least coöperate by not entering fields already occupied, except to work through union institutions.

In view particularly of the confusion created among non-Christian peoples by denominational divisions among Christians, the conference urges immediate steps toward the unification of Protestant home and foreign mission boards. We further believe that the spirit characterizing Christian missionaries should be one of mutual sharing, of receiving as well as giving, instead of the spirit of superiority and overlordship which too often in the past has marked Christian approaches to other faiths and cultures. Western Christianity should go to the non-Christian world in a spirit of brotherhood, and should recognize the right of younger Christian churches to the largest possible measure of self determination in the expression of their loyalty to Jesus.

VII.

The conference believes that the old gospel was a social gospel. The sermon on the mount is the most striking and penetrating social document in history. The greatest single task of Christians is to integrate its teachings into the social order. The kingdom of God means, in part, the brotherhood of man. The greatest single task of the church is to widen its small and limited brotherhoods into this brotherhood of all men. No one church and no one denomination can do this. Such work can only be done through coöperation. In turn, coöperation does more to break down sectarian lines than any direct efforts toward union. Direct efforts often fix attention upon differences and the very processes of discussion often drive contenders for the various faiths to defense. The social gospel of Jesus challenges to goals above the lines of division, and the greatness of the moral or spiritual value shrink into their due proportions. We believe that devotion to the great ethical and human objectives of the social gospel of Jesus will do more to unite the genuinely moral and spiritual forces of the churches than all considerations of logic, history, sacrament, dogma, and church economics. We believe that the moral power resident in Christian personalities and institutions must be made to operate in those social relationships from which

fiction and strife arise, or the unbrotherliness of the social order will submerge all the good-will and fraternalism the church can build up within itself.

VIII.

The conference regards it as significant that Jesus did not leave a model creed for his followers to sign, but did leave them a model prayer to repeat. This is all the more meaningful when we remember that prayer is of the essence of religion. In its address is revealed the God of one's faith, and in its petition the dominant desire of the heart. So in our Lord's prayer, the God to whom it is addressed is our Father, and the dominant desire is the coming of his kingdom or rule on earth. We believe that this prayer carries at its heart the spiritual seed concept which promises ultimately a harvest of Christian unity. Its address is significant — "Our Father." By that possessive pronoun the sincere and intelligent petitioner includes all men as children of one Father and, by implication, brothers to one another. Is it possible for all the churches to continue to make that prayer together without an ever-increasing circumference of sympathy which shall one day include a world in its sonship and brotherhood? Then the petition "thy kingdom come" provides a unity of purpose which may one day give us a oneness of program. Therefore, we ask as the disciples of Jesus did, "Lord, teach us how to pray," with the purpose not of receiving a new form of prayer, but that we may learn *how* to make this prayer; for in the day when we can all make it in unity of spirit, we shall be one.

IX.

Finally, this conference would emphasize the urgency of the task of finding ways to Christian unity. The life of Protestantism, and eventually of Christianity itself, is at stake. The pressure of present failure is upon us. Jesus said that a house divided cannot stand: what assurance have we that the Lord's house when divided against itself can stand? Jesus prayed on the night before his crucifixion that his followers be one, and he gave a reason for that prayer — "That the world may believe that thou didst send me." However discomfoting it may be, we cannot escape the truth that our divisions are, in part, responsible for the defeat of our Christian hope.

We all believe in the same God, the same Christ, the same Holy Spirit, and the same Bible. Then why are we so divided? The mere asking of the question is a powerful indictment of the fictitious causes that lie at the basis of our divisions. The things that divide us are not only fictitious but they are totally unworthy of the living Christ and a common-sense world. People will never think alike in everything. It would be a dreary and

unnatural world if they did. Uniformity in religion is unnatural and artificial, as it is in everything else. Diversity in unity is the law of nature. It must become the law of the church. The absorption of one church by another, as a means of achieving unity, is impossible in this age of intelligence. Then wherein lies our hope of reconciliation? In recognizing the equality of all Christians before God. We urge this ideal upon the churches, and its realization as rapidly as possible through the practice of open membership and unrestricted communion to all who have accepted Jesus as Lord and Savior. We recognize the reasons for the origin of denominations. We are grateful for what the different denominations have contributed to religious thinking and life. But we affirm that none of the interpretations of God, of Christ, and of the Bible as held to-day by the two hundred different denominations as barriers to their fellowship with other Christians, is in the realm of vital Christianity. There is not a single fundamental Christian truth that is the distinctive possession of any one denomination.

Out of a divided church there must come a united Christendom, which shall be neither Protestant nor Catholic, but containing the best in both — a church whose predominant characteristic shall be Christian: Christian in its sympathies, Christian in its courage, Christian in its adventures. The way for us to get Christian unity is to become Christian. And our distance from that goal may accurately measure the distance we are from one another. But the difficulties in the way of Christian unity cannot be so great as the tragedy of a defeated church and a betrayed Christ.

Committee:

BURRIS A. JENKINS, *Chairman*

Minister Linwood Christian Church, Kansas City

DAVID J. EVANS

Minister First Baptist Church, Kansas City

SAMUEL HARKNESS

Minister Immanuel Presbyterian Church, Kansas City

M. ASHBY JONES

Pastor Second Baptist Church, St. Louis

CLIFF TITUS

Minister First Community Church of Christ, Joplin, Mo.

EDWIN D. STARBUCK

Head, Department of Philosophy, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa

CARL AGEES

Minister Christian Church, Columbia, Mo.

ROSS W. SANDERSON

Administrative Secretary, Council of Churches, Wichita, Kan.

W. B. MATHEWS

Minister Central Church of Christ, Des Moines, Iowa

JOSEPH MYERS, JR.

Managing Editor *The Christian*, Kansas City.

MILTON C. TOWNER

Professor Religious Education (Presbyterian), Bible College of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.

WHAT PEOPLE AND PAPERS ARE SAYING ABOUT UNITY

Protestantism in Virginia Reveals Debts Owed Both to Catholic and Jew

THIS brief survey avoids the attempt to estimate the significance of the Protestant churches by amassing an array of statistics. Statistics are avoided for two reasons: First, because accurate church statistics are not available and the methods of reporting vary so widely in the several denominations that they do not furnish a valid basis of comparison; secondly, because the value of the contribution which religion makes to a community is to be judged not primarily by quantitative, but by qualitative measurements.

My object is to set forth in succinct fashion some of the problems and tasks that confront the Protestant churches in their relation one to another, and in their relations to other organized religious forces.

(a) The Protestant churches in their relations one to another have made some steady progress toward better understanding and coöperation. The day when we shall attain to any status approaching organic unity is doubtless far in the future, but we have for the most part left behind us the destructive methods of trying to build up our own church by pulling down our neighbor's church.

There was a day in Virginia when Baptists and Episcopalians gave one another little quarter in the debate as to the validity of infant baptism; when Methodists and Presbyterians waged warfare on the relative merits of free grace and predestination; when questions of church polity, such as the Episcopal, Presbyterian or Congregational, were propounded as mutually exclusive terms; and when the use or non-use of ritual in public worship was made the gauge of spirituality.

At the present time, the leaders in the Protestant churches of Virginia have reached an attitude toward one another on these questions of denominational loyalties which may be described as the policy of "live and let live." We are beginning to view our differences not so much as contradictions of one another but as contributions which we each have to make to the interpretation of the church which is larger than any particular denomination.

The chief problems that confront the Protestant churches to-day are those that run straight across denominational lines and which can effectually be solved only when we make common cause and recognize that in union is strength. Among the outstanding problems that confront all Protestant churches alike, I would note the following by way of illustration:

First: Why, for example, in a small village should there be four or more struggling congregations, with four clergymen visiting the community occasionally, rather than one strong congregation adequately supporting one resident minister?

Second: Youth and religious education. Through the public school system the children of any given community, irrespective of church affiliation, are receiving a common ground work of education. The problem of supplementing this secular education with adequate religious training is one that is essentially the same for all the churches and demands co-operation for its solution.

Third: Modernism and fundamentalism. The adjustment of traditional theology to the modern scientific point of view is a problem that all Protestant churches must face. In the approach to this task there is a bond of understanding between conservatives, on the one hand, and liberals, on the other, which transcends all denominational barriers.

Fourth: Christian ethics and industrialism. In the early stages of Protestantism Christian ethics was thought out chiefly in terms of individual relationships. In the present generation the question that challenges all of the Protestant churches is whether the Christian principles of brotherhood and co-operation can manifest themselves in our modern industrial relationships.

(b) The relation of Protestantism to other organized religious forces, raises specifically the question of the attitude of Protestants toward Catholics and Jews. On this point there is such wide divergence of opinion among Protestants that I can express my view only as an individual. There are two considerations which appeal to me as essentially Christian in spirit and which, if acted upon, give promise of better things to come.

First: An attitude of appreciation of the historical debt that the Protestant owes to both the Jew and the Catholic. If St. Paul could say, "I am debtor both to the Greeks and the Barbarians," the Protestant has no less ground for saying, "I am debtor both to Jew and Catholic."

To the Jews we are indebted for the Old Testament. They were God's chosen people for keeping alive the idealism of the one true God in the ancient world. It was out of the soil of Judaism that the Christian religion sprang, and we need constantly to remember that Jesus Christ came as a Jew proclaiming the good news of the kingdom of heaven.

To Catholicism the Protestant is indebted for the devoted loyalty which wrought the Christian faith into the fabric of Western civilization and kept the torch burning, however dimly, in the middle ages.

When we remember, too, that Catholicism has produced such characters as St. Francis of Assisi and Cardinal Mercier, that it has given to the world such leaders as Pasteur and Marshal Foch, we recognize that our debt far outweighs our prejudices.

Second: Growing unity of effort in community service. We have learned in our philanthropic enterprises to combine our efforts. The Red Cross knows no distinction of church. In the campaign for the community chest, held every year in Richmond, Norfolk and other cities, Jew, Roman Catholic and Protestant stand upon a common platform, recognizing that "all service ranks the same with God." In the fields of public health, public welfare and public education we are learning to mediate our religion through our citizenship.

The vital issue confronting all churches alike to-day is not episcopacy versus presbyterianism or congregationalism, not even protestantism versus Roman catholicism, but Christianity versus secularism, a spiritual interpretation of life versus thoroughgoing materialism, the moral standard of Christ versus sheer licentiousness. When we raise aloft the banner of our common task under the leadership of the Spirit of Jesus Christ, then the party issues which now divide us will in many instances answer themselves—they will become dead issues and we can leave the dead to bury their own dead.

[From Rev. Beverley D. Tucker, Jr., D.D., in *The Times-Dispatch*, Richmond, Va.]

What Earthly Good Are the Denominations?

DENOMINATIONS are like disease germs, sects are like streptococci; they must serve some purpose, but the Lord only knows what it is. So far as our limited vision goes, they cause only trouble in the world. They are a condition that confronts

us, a defect in the order of things, a handicap to labor under, and not an end to be promoted.

The troubles caused by sects are so apparent that one needs scarcely to rehearse them. We have divided councils, pulling and hauling at each other, with little forward motion and the generation of much heat. Like an army or an expedition or a migration without unified command, we scatter, criss-cross each other's trail, pass by the most important places, and wind up far apart, at fault, lost, futile. We waste force and dissipate funds. Then we duplicate, several parties grabbing at once for the same points of vantage for attack or the same river valleys for settlement. The heart-breaking sight is so common we have become calloused — six denominational churches in a town of six hundred and a seventh one moving in because, it says, "There is no real Christian church in the place. We must go and start one that is Simon pure." Six untrained, bigoted, little preachers, or only three, or none at all; and any there may chance to be, miserably supported, without books, without contacts with the world, absorbed in the petty village fights and jealousies between sect and sect. The denominational mission boards, meantime, pouring their funds and sending their absentee-supported emissaries into the "field" to hold up their particular colored light, red, green, yellow, in the darkness as if it were a "heathen" land — and heathen it is, to be sure. Then in this heathen village the church workers, the guilds and ladies' aids, miserable little handfuls, spend their time backbiting, envying, hating each other, while the real men of the place are sick of the whole thing. In larger places, you'll see four churches on four corners of the courthouse square, where two or one were amply sufficient. In big cities you'll see a dozen churches in a half-mile square where two or three great cathedrals, with a plural ministry, might gather in and care for all the people ten times more efficiently. You'll see each congregation trying to take members away from the others; you'll see ministers jealous of each other, making unkind remarks about each other, envying and sometimes even hating each other, when they should be pulling together to try to bring men and women under the influence of a common Lord, trying to alleviate the sorrows and the distresses and solve the problems of the people who cannot fail to see the division and the hostility so easy to behold. There is nothing Christian about it. It is worse than pagan.

What shall we do, then? What constructive word can be spoken in this well-nigh hopeless condition? This much, that

all those large minded enough may try consciously to fulfill the prayer of our Lord, "That they all may be one," by working together as much as possible and pulling apart as little as possible; that the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America command the allegiance of us all, nationally, and state and city federations locally; that as many coöperative movements as possible be fostered by the denominations, or at least by those leaders in denominations, gentle and sweet spirited enough, strong and brave enough, brotherly and Christ-like enough, to range themselves side by side, instead of toe to toe. Weekday schools of religion, Christmas and Easter union services, united efforts of all kinds — these are multiplying in the larger centers and spreading even to smaller ones.

A further sign of hope is coming up over the horizon. More and more individual churches, regardless of denomination, are becoming community churches. Their denominational bonds grow more and more tenuous and less and less emphasized. These churches reduce the body of required doctrine to the lowest possible terms, the belief in Jesus as the Christ, son of God and son of man, and the will to serve and follow him. If any creed is recited in these churches, it is only as an ancient symbol, a ceremonial, valued only for its flavor of tradition and its atmosphere of worship. No actual and formal assent is required as if it were a scientific formula. In these community churches the day for such theologizing has gone by. The recognized essence of the Christian faith, common to all denominations, alone is demanded of the membership — allegiance to Jesus. The right to define all terms for himself is left to the individual.

Along with this minimum of belief goes the minimum of required form. The two sacraments of the church, upon which all are in general agreed, baptism and the Lord's supper, are administered by such form and at such time as the individual may himself determine. The forms and ceremonials of public worship, ritual and liturgy, emerge from the cultural environment and heritage of the people making up the community church. Whatever is adapted to their minds and spirits is adopted into the forms and service of the community church.

Free trade in members is the order between such churches. Letters of commendation or statements of membership pass at their face value. There is no protective tariff on the interchange of church members; there are no immigration laws, no educational nor doctrinal tests for admission. In some quarters this is called open membership. It has been practiced a long

time by some churches, but only newly adopted by some others. The point is, that it is an increasing practice, that the number of these undenominational, free, or community churches, is increasing in all quarters of the land. Naturally, these community churches thrill and throb with alertness to the spirit of the times, to the emergence of new truth, to the adoption of new measures. They are fully conscious that the essence of the Christian faith remains the same from age to age, that Jesus is the same, yesterday, today and forever; but they also recognize that new lights are turned upon him and upon his teaching from generation to generation and century to century, that knowledge grows from more to more and with it more of reverence may dwell in us all. So they are out for everything new and true, everything beautiful and good. These churches do not fight the rising tide of increasing truth but try to ride higher upon it.

Why should these free churches not cut loose from their old denominations entirely and become wholly independent? Some day perhaps they will, and in that line may lie the path of real Christian unity. It is too soon, however, for most of such churches to sever entirely their old denominational ties. The number of avowed community churches, with no denominational tie at all, and now bound together in an association, is something over sixteen hundred; but this movement is not yet powerful enough to render it safe for certain churches, already community churches in everything else but name, to shake themselves free from the denominational entanglements in which they were born and in which they have lived. After all, humanity is gregarious. We cannot flock alone. No church can develop or grow, scarcely even survive, that strikes out by itself on an entirely independent course. The experience of such churches has been that they have floated along more or less precariously during the life and activity of some more or less brilliant leader and then have broken up and sunk beneath the waves. For efficiency and for permanency there must exist ties with other churches, solidarity, community of interest, fellowship in effort and inspiration. These may all be present, however, with a decreasing emphasis upon denominational aims and purposes, slogans and doctrines, properties and organizations. An increasing number of churches in great cities, consciously or unconsciously, are plunging ahead upon this course. The outstanding churches in most cities grow less and less denominational and are more and more to be defined as com-

munity churches. This comes nearest to a rainbow of anything that hangs in our Christian sky.

[From Dr. Burris A. Jenkins, Kansas City, in *Religious Education*, Chicago.]

Unity of Methodists and Presbyterians

WHAT may prove to be the most momentous meeting in American church history, was held on January 30, 1929, in the First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh. It was as quiet almost as the sunrise, but it may prove to be like the sunrise in bringing light, and warmth, and life.

Its proximate cause dates back several months to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which sat through the month of May, 1928, in Kansas City. That body had a committee on state of the church, which considered various memorials asking for church union.

This committee on state of the church, without a dissenting vote, adopted a certain report and, through its chairman, President Daniel L. Marsh of Boston University, presented it to the General Conference on May 10. The report proposed a commission on interdenominational relations, superseding all similar commissions and committees previously appointed, and contained this significant paragraph: "We recommend that this commission be authorized to make overtures to, and receive overtures from like-minded churches, looking toward closer coöperation and union."

The report was adopted by an overwhelming vote. It was clearly evident that the Methodists wanted church union, such union to include all churches like-minded. The commission authorized by this action was appointed a few days later. It consists of seven bishops, fifteen other ministers, and fifteen laymen.

On May 12, the day following the adoption of this important report, a remarkable thing happened. A certain memorial had been prepared, which was not, like the action already taken, general in character, but was very specific. That memorial reads as follows:

"The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, and the Methodist Episcopal Church should be united. Their purposes are alike, and they work in much the same territory. Practically their only differences now are in details of organi-

zation, and surely these can not justify their remaining apart, for in union there would be added strength."

"The Presbyterians have an honorable history, and a commendable spirit, and they are doing a work of magnitude and value beyond measure. To be actually united with that noble people would be to us a joy and an inspiration.

"We, therefore, urge that overtures be at once made looking for early organic union, without reservation or condition."

The following day the memorial was adopted unanimously with great enthusiasm and applause. Bishop Edwin H. Hughes, fraternal delegate, was instructed to present it to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, then in session at Tulsa, Oklahoma.

The Presbyterians have long had a committee to consider interdenominational relations, called the department of church coöperation and union. It is composed of fifteen of the ministers and laymen of that great church. When the invitation from the Methodists was received, it was referred to that department, and instructions were given to confer with the Methodist commission, and report to the next General Assembly.

Following this auspicious beginning the Methodist commission met in Philadelphia and organized. Three sub-committees were formed, one of which was on union with other than Methodist churches, and of course to this committee this matter was referred. The committee consists of three bishops, six other ministers, and six laymen, including the chairman and the secretary of the commission, as already named. The sub-committee organized by electing Bishop Herbert Welsh, of Pittsburgh, as chairman, and Dr. Eugene M. Antrim, president of Oklahoma City University, as secretary.

The Methodist committee on union with other than Methodist churches met next in the Hotel Roosevelt, Pittsburgh, January 29, and held sessions morning, afternoon, and evening. They were united and emphatic in their conviction that reasons for these churches remaining apart do not exist, while reasons for uniting are overwhelming, and they were entirely agreed that the proposed union should be consummated without unnecessary delay. They were unanimous in the desire to show the Presbyterian representatives every courtesy, and also in the willingness to accept any proposal upon which the Presbyterians themselves might agree.

But Wednesday was the great day. The chosen representatives of the two great denominations met together. Organi-

zation was effected by electing as chairman the head of the Presbyterian department of church coöperation and union, Dr. J. Ross Stevenson, president of Princeton Theological Seminary, with Dr. Eugene M. Antrim as secretary.

Of the fifteen Presbyterian representatives, ten were in attendance: Rev. Dr. J. Ross Stevenson, Princeton, New Jersey; Rev. Dr. Lewis S. Mudge, Philadelphia; Rev. Dr. William H. Black, Marshall, Missouri; Rev. Dr. Joseph A. Vance, Detroit, Michigan; Rev. Dr. William P. Merrill, New York City; Rev. Dr. William O. Thompson, Columbus, Ohio; Rev. Dr. Henry C. Swearingen, St. Paul, Minnesota; Dr. Robert E. Speer, New York City; Mr. Holmes Forsyth, Chicago; and Mr. Thomas D. McCloskey, Pittsburgh.

Of the fifteen Methodist representatives, thirteen were present: Bishop Herbert Welch, Pittsburgh; Bishop Frederick D. Leete, Omaha, Nebraska; Bishop William F. McDowell, Washington, D. C.; Rev. Dr. Eugene M. Antrim, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Rev. Dr. Ray Allen, Buffalo, New York; Rev. Dr. Orrin W. Auman, Chicago; Rev. Dr. John H. Race, New York City; Rev. Dr. Harry E. Woolever, Washington, D. C.; Mr. Ernest H. Cherrington, Westerville, Ohio; Mr. Earl R. Conder, Indianapolis, Indiana; Prof. William A. Elliott, Meadville, Pennsylvania; Mr. Frank A. Horne, Brooklyn, New York; Dean James A. James, Evanston, Illinois.

No one was blind to the obstacles in the way, but everybody seemed confident that they all could be removed. A committee was appointed, consisting of Dr. Mudge, Dr. Thompson, Dr. Speer, Bishop Welch, Dr. Allen, and Mr. Cherrington, to express the sentiments of the body. This committee considered the matter carefully around the dinner table, worked out a statement prepared by Dr. Speer, and reported it back to the entire body, where it was accepted without opposition or change.

The report provides for the appointment of two committees, one on polity and doctrine, and the other on administration and property interests, with the full recognition that the work of each would be very heavy, and should be begun without delay.

So with exaltation and fervent prayer that significant meeting closed. The chosen representatives of 6,766,373 church members had spent a memorable day together. They had expressed unanimous agreement that there should be early organic union of the two great churches which they represented. They

recognized, too, that the union should not be confined to these, but should include also all other churches like-minded.

Never before in the history of mankind has there been such a meeting. Its import is astounding.

[From Dr. Ray Allen in *The Christian Herald*, New York.]

Shall We Try to Save Denominationalism?

SOME expounders of the denominational theory of church organization talk as though this were in the fixed and eternal order of things. They insist that the difference of temperament makes denominations necessary. But are there two hundred different kinds of temperament? And with the denominational order is there any real grouping on temperamental lines? One may find Methodist churches almost as formal as some kinds of Episcopal churches. One may find some Disciple churches quite as intellectual as some Congregational churches. One may find a lot of evangelistic fervor in Presbyterian churches, more than in some of the Baptist churches. It is mostly preachers who talk about denominations as homes for temperament. At this most laymen smile.

We might change the form of our denominations. If there were denominations organized around the modern questions of religion this might seem more to the point. But modern men of various kinds tend to believe that differing from another man in opinion does not mean that they shall not worship with him nor eat with him. Both Republicans and Democrats eat together in Rotary clubs; in Kiwanis clubs are both Protestants and Catholics. In fact the members of such organizations glory in this tolerance, and make a virtue of it. Only in religion is separation and intolerance held to be a virtue.

Christianity is sick to death in many countries of the world to-day. One of its diseases—not its only one—is its divisions and lack of brotherhood among believers. This leads many to believe that Christianity may be saved only by a radical reorganization of its forces.

Defenders of the denominational order are in most cases in good conscience. But increasingly the great writers on religion and the great prophets of the day hold that the Christian religion must realize the unity for which Christ prayed or it is doomed.

[From *The Community Churchman*, Park Ridge, Ill.]

Union of the Evangelical, Reformed, and United Brethren Churches

AT a joint meeting of all the representatives of the three church bodies on February 7, 1929, at Dayton, Ohio, the final revision of the basis for union was completed and adopted without a dissenting vote. In the opinion of those who have worked out the plan of union and have worked it over repeatedly it not only safeguards all the essential contributions of each of the uniting bodies — Evangelical, Reformed, and United Brethren — but welds all of them together into a much stronger and more effective instrument for advancing the interests of the kingdom of God than any of them has been heretofore.

On the evening of that day the members of the three commissions and a number of visitors and guests gathered at the Hotel Van Cleve for a fellowship dinner given by Dr. Wm. R. Funk, agent of the Otterbein Press. A most beautiful fraternal spirit prevailed and Bishop H. H. Fout, who presided, introduced Bishop A. R. Clippinger, resident bishop of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ. Responses were given by Dr. Geo. W. Richards, of the Reformed Church, and Dr. H. R. Niebuhr, of the Evangelical Synod, which were followed by brief remarks by a number of commissioners and guests. The fine courtesy of Dr. Funk, and the gracious spirit manifested by the representatives of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ, which has its headquarters in Dayton, was thoroughly appreciated by all the visitors. It was generally agreed that this pleasant occasion was to be but the beginning of more fraternal fellowship and closer relations among the three bodies until complete organic union could be effected. Every opportunity for the fullest possible discussion will be provided. By the time the district conferences assemble all this material will have been made available so that definite action may be taken at each conference.

[From *The Evangelical Herald*, St. Louis, Mo.]

Baptists and Disciples Consider Union

January 30, 1929, will stand as a significant day in American church history. On that day, in the William Penn Hotel, Pittsburgh, Baptists and Disciples were making overtures. Is there any reason why these two denominations should not merge? There may be reasons, but in the light of current Protestant trends, these should not count. Protestantism must unite or perish. Denominationalism has run its day. Intelligent

people will no longer support it. The things that divide are too trivial. There are traditions, of course; but are traditions dearer than the progress of God's reign? The main question, in my own mind, is whether the Disciples should turn toward an immersionist body for union, or whether the overture should be to the Congregationalist groups. May it not be that our strong democratic impulses would eventually make us more at home among the Congregationalists than among those so strongly committed to immersion? After all, is immersion the large factor which the Disciples care to be known for? I would doubt that. The Disciples have one large contribution to make and that is the passion for Christian union. To tie back into an immersionist body might not be the shortest way to realization. Favorable to union as I am, I would think twice before I would vote to merge with the Baptists, unless I were convinced that the immersionist dogma were weakening.

[From Dr. John Ray Ewers, Pittsburgh, in *The Christian Century*, Chicago.]

A New Roman Catholic Move

One of the chief concerns of Roman Catholic policy at the moment is to effect a rapprochement with the Greek Orthodox Church. The present field of operations is in Poland, where, according to *Das Evangelische Deutschland*, extreme measures have been adopted, on instructions from the Vatican, to conciliate the members of the Orthodox communion, with whom strained relations have existed. Any appearance of proselytism is strictly forbidden. The Roman Catholic clergy are advised to keep in close touch with the Orthodox clergy, to hold joint conferences on their spiritual work, to take part in each other's services, and even in special cases to share in the administration of the sacrament. Above all, they are urged to avoid the reproach of attempting to impose the observance of their own ceremonies and customs on the members of the sister church. These diplomatic methods represent a distinctly new departure on the part of the papacy.

[From *The Christian World*, London.]

A CORRECTION. In the January number of *The Quarterly*, page 261, at the end of the 24th line, after the words "fellowship in Christians" there ought to have been an asterisk, and at the bottom of the page the following note: Some would add to the above, "and, as touching faith, should be a sufficient basis for a reunited church."

BOOK REVIEWS

CHRISTIAN UNITY—Its History and Challenge in all Communion, in all Lands. By Rev. Gaius Jackson Slosser, Ph.D., Department of Church History and History of Doctrine, Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh. With Introductions by Dr. Temple, Archbishop of York, and Dr. Garvie, Principal of Hackney and New College, London. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.; pages 425; price \$5.00.

This is the book we have long waited for. It is the first attempt at a thorough and complete presentation of the history and development of Christian unity in all communions in all countries. The fact that Christian unity has got this far along so as to fill such a handsome volume is evidence of the real beginning of the task. This book indicates an immense amount of research.

It begins with the council of Jerusalem, A.D., 49, and presents the underlying causes that had to do with subsequent councils, such as Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, and other councils. It discusses the division between the east and the west (1054) and the division in the west (1500-1550); then the various conferences from Marburg (1529) to the peace of Westphalia (1641-1648). Great characters in the Christian unity movement are discussed, among them Baxter, Drury, Grotius, Calixtus, Leibnitz, Bossuet, Calvin, Wesley, and others. The influence of modern missions and scientific education are given large places.

Then a new day dawns. *Rapprochments* characterized most of the churches. Organizations for Christian unity were formed, experiments were made, federations for Christian service arose among Potestants, encyclicals came from Rome and Constantinople, indications among all denominations were for a larger understanding, and a general restlessness for something better than we now have appears to be the mind of the churches everywhere, closing with helps and hindrances to progress.

The appendix is particularly valuable, including a chronology of Christian unity covering fourteen pages, world wide denominational statistics, and the Lausanne conference reports.

Dr. Slosser has done a piece of work which will be found very valuable in Christian unity study, both for its thoroughness and its world wide survey. He shows that Christian unity has been a principle from the beginning of Christianity, struggling for expression, and that no days are so hopeful for "the will to unity" as these days. Consequently this book is a challenge to the Christians of these times. It is a work of high merit.

THE CATHOLIC LIFE. Addresses and Papers Delivered at the Fourth Annual Catholic Congress, New York City, Nov. 13 to 15, 1928. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co.; pages 140; price \$1.75.

Among the many parties in the church one of the most aggressive is the Anglo-Catholic with a history reaching back to the Oxford movement. The purpose of these congresses is to deepen their hold on the eternal verities, to unfold the beauties of the Catholic faith, and to spread to wider circles the things which they hold dear. All of the addresses are interesting; several of them would have been stronger had they omitted their digs at Roman Catholicism on one hand and Protestantism on the other. That attitude is a decided weakness. Years ago it was the common attitude for all the parties in the church — they had to show what they were not and, in doing so, reflected on other denominations; they had to show what they were, which was the true and only way. We are living in a time when we are not thinking so much about those from whom we differ as about those with whom we are in agreement. The Anglo-Catholics are most like the Roman Catholics. The minor point of the primacy of Peter or the equality of the bishops is like some of the tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee differences between Methodists and Presbyterians or Baptists and Disciples. There is no good reason why they should not cultivate closer relations with the Vatican, which, however, cannot be done, if they are forever digging at Roman Catholicism. An Anglo-Catholic becoming a Roman Catholic is no more dishonor than a Presbyterian becoming an Episcopalian. Those groups that are close kin should exercise their Christian forbearance and inclusiveness, if not actual union, as preparatory to the larger union that is to come.

LAW OR WAR. By Lucia Ames Mead. New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co.; pages 276; price \$1.75.

In the field of the abolition of war and the establishment of better international relations, Mrs. Mead is at her best. In the preface she says, "By a right and resolute course war between nations may be abolished in a generation, as witchcraft, slavery, and yellow fever have been abolished." In the twelve chapters she discusses the history of the peace movement, education, the World Court, preparedness, neglected facts, interdependence, creating the international mind, dangerous fallacies, the points of view of militarists and peace makers, patriotic songs, arbitration, the League of Nations, before and after the war, and the use of armed force. The appendix contains a list of some of the peace organizations and the covenant of the League of Nations. It takes its place as one of the most valuable books on the destruction of warfare.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE PRESENT MORAL UNREST. New York: Oxford University Press; pages 225; price \$2.00.

To say that this book is the outcome of the Copec meeting in Birmingham, England, in 1924, is one of the highest commendations that can be given it. The contributors are Dr. A. D. Lindsay, Dr. J. H. Muirhead, Canon Quick, Dr. G. F. Barbour, Dr. J. A. Thompson, Dr. Temple and others. Some of the subjects are: "The Christian Ideal and Some of its Competitors," "Goodness and Justice," "The Family," and "The Evolutionist and the Biological View of Life." It is a fine interpretation of the principles and message of Christianity as must be understood in the common life of mutual service. It is only in experience and fellowship that men can learn the will of God. This book says it well.

THE DIVINE REVOLUTION. Studies and Reflections upon the Passion of Our Lord. By W. G. Peck, author of *The Values of the Sacrament*, etc. Milwaukee: Morehouse Publishing Co.; pages, 245; price, \$2.40.

This is a book of commanding attention. The cross will ever remain as the center of Christian philosophy. Interpretations may differ, but as the author says, "Nothing in the creative source of the universe can contradict what we see upon the cross." Christ is the ultimate reality, "choosing a new experience in face of a new situation; and there is an elucidation of the nature of God's action and the nature of man's action at one and the same time." The book is divided into three parts: (1) The motive of the passion; (2) the incidence of the passion; (3) the results of the passion, closing with an appendix in which is discussed passion and action. In his death on the cross Christ laid down anew the foundations of this world's life, making it impossible to reconcile with it the economics of industrialism or armed nationalism.

BOSTON. A Novel by Upton Sinclair. New York: Albert and Charles Boni; 2 volumes, pages 755; price \$5.00.

This is one of the most thrilling stories of modern times. It is the whole story of the Sacco-Vanzetti case where mingled New England "blue bloods" and Italian anarchists, where intrigue, prejudice, idealism, and class struggle give to the novelist material out of which he makes a great literary invention. One's attention is held from the beginning to the close. There is no American fiction just like it—it stings, it pleads, it denounces, it blesses, leaving Sacco and Vanzetti as names translated into symbols for the triumph of the class struggle in America.

The Christian Union Quarterly

**INTERDENOMINATIONAL AND
INTERNATIONAL**

Contents of Volume XVIII

JULY, 1928, TO APRIL, 1929

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Ainslie, D.D., Rev. Peter	PAGE
Baltimore Conference on Unity, The.....	40
Baltimore Conference Again, The	10
Bishop Charles H. Brent, The Passing of.....	275
Call of the Episcopal Bishops, The.....	181
Christian Unity Conferences.....	179
Denominational Currents	275
Dr. Rogers and Intercommunion	183
Dr. Rogers and Intercommunion Again	279
Editor's Notes.....	3, 99
Federal Council, The	180
Kansas City Conference	105
Kansas City Conference, The	277
Paris Pact, The	103
Protests of Denominationalism to Brotherhood, The.....	106
Universal Religious Peace Conference, The	103
Will the Churches Sign a Reconciliation Pact Among Themselves?	282
American Protestants Getting Together—Federal Council Bulletin....	153
Appeal Must be to Christ, The—Rt. Rev. Edward L. Parsons.....	264
Approaches to Unity—Morris H. Turk, D.D.	304
Allen, Dr. Ray. Unity of Methodists and Presbyterians.....	360
Ames, Ph.D., Rev. Edward Scribner. Nature and Extent of Unity....	324
Arnold, Mathew.....	323
As a Modernist Sees It—The London Times.....	158
As an Anglo-Catholic Sees It—Rev. Francis J. Hall.....	160
As an Indian Y.M.C.A. Worker Sees It—Shoran S. Singha.....	164
As Another Episcopalian Sees It—Rev. James A. Mitchell.....	44
Ashworth, D.D., Rev. Robert A. Protestant High Churchmanship....	207
Atkinson, D.D., Rev. Henry A. Progress Toward Religious Unity....	316
 Baltimore Conference on Unity (No. 2), The—The Living Church.....	 48
Baptists Welcome Round Table—The Baptist	262
Baptist, The. Baptists Welcome Round Table.....	262
Baptist, The. The Tendency to Ape Rome.....	58
Baptists and Disciples Consider Union—Rev. John Ray Ewers.....	364
Banninga, D.D., Rev. John J. Progress in Church Union in South India	128
Bell, D.D., LL.D., Bishop William M. A Restudy of Church Union.....	231
Brown, D.D., Rev. Arthur Judson. Should Churches Unite—Now?	139
Brown, D.D., Rev. William Adams. Next Steps	15
Brown, Ralph W. New England Conference on Christian Unity.....	260

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XVIII

371

	PAGE
Burton, D.D., Rev. Charles Emerson. The Proposed Union of the Christian and Congregational Churches	121
Can the Religions of the World be Mobilized for Peace?—Rev. Frederick Lynch, D.D.	187
Call to Patriots, A. Thomas Curtis Clark.....	245
Christian Unity and the General Convention—Rev. Beverley D. Tucker, Jr., D.D.	194
Christian Reunion as One of the Monks of Unity Sees It—Dom Andre de Lilienfeld	161
Christian Value-Judgment in Relation to Christian Union—Professor W. J. Lhamon.....	220
Christian Century, The. Church Union in Scotland.....	166
Christian World, The. A New Roman Catholic Move.....	365
Church Union in Scotland—The Christian Century.....	166
Churchman, The. Doorways to Unity.....	55
Communion—Mary Marquis	303
Conference at Mena, Egypt—The Egyptian Gazette	168
Clarke, Thomas Curtis. A Call to Patriots	245
Community Churchman, The. Shall We Try to Save Denominationalism?	363
Contribution of the Rochester Meeting of the Federal Council to Christian Unity, The—Rev. John Milton Moore, D.D.	202
Coffin, D.D., Rev. F. G. The Proposed Union of the Christian and the Congregational Churches	119
Difficulties in the Way of Christian Unity—Rev. Samuel Harkness, D.D.	337
Doorways to Unity—The Churchman.....	55
Dreams—Alfred Noyes	315
Evangelical Herald, The. Union of the Evangelical, Reformed and United Brethren Churches	364
Expansion—Charles Summer Hoyt.....	127
Egyptian Gazette, The. Conference at Mena, Egypt.....	168
Ewers, Dr. John Ray. Baptists and Disciples Consider Union.....	364
False Steps Toward Unity (No. 1)—The Living Church.....	37
Federal Council Bulletin. American Protestants Getting Together ...	153
Findings of the Midwest Conference on Christian Unity, Kansas City.	349
Foster, O. D. Church Union at Iowa State Teachers College.....	167
From Lausanne to Main Street—Rev. Fred Smith.....	134
Growing Unity of the Church, The—Rev. Frederick Lynch, D.D.....	112
Hall, D.D., Rev. Francis J. As an Anglo-Catholic Sees It.....	160
Hart, Rev. Madison A.—Problems of Our Coöperative Work.....	236

	PAGE
Harkness, D.D., Rev. Samuel. Difficulties in the Way of Christian Unity	337
Harrison, Hiram B.....	36
Hermann, Edward A. G. Life and Creeds..	133
Herald of Gospel Liberty, The. Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit.....	263
Hoyt, Charles Summer. Expansion.....	127
Interdenominational Communion Service in Ohio—The Ohio Christian News	60
Indwelling Spirit, The. Gertrude B. Walker	336
Immediate Obligations Toward Christian Unity, The—Dr. James M. Philputt	252
Jenkins, D.D., Rev. Burris A. What Earthly Good Are the Denominations?	356
Jordan, David Starr. There Was a Man.....	219
Lhamon, Professor W. J. Christian Value-Judgment in Relation to Christian Union	220
Life and Creeds—Edward A. G. Hermann.....	133
Lilienfeld, O.S.B., Dom Andre de. Christian Reunion as One of the Monks of Unity Sees It.....	161
Living Church, The. False Steps Toward Unity (No. 1)	37
Living Church, The. The Baltimore Conference on Unity (No. 2).....	48
Lynch, D.D., Rev. Frederick. The Growing Unity of the Church.....	112
Lynch, D.D., Rev. Frederick. Can the Religions of the World be Mobilized for Peace?.....	187
Lynch, D.D., Rev. Frederick. The Significance of the Italo-Vatican Concordat for Christian Unity.....	298
McDowell, D.D., LL.D., Bishop William F. Methodist Proposals for Union	200
McVicker, Vinton E. Ohio Christian Unity Program for 1930.....	342
Marquis, Mary. Communion	303
Methodist Proposals for Union—Bishop William F. McDowell, D.D., LL.D.	200
Mitchell, Rev. James A. As Another Episcopalian Sees It.....	44
Moore, D.D., Rev. John Milton. The Contribution of the Rochester Meeting of the Federal Council to Christian Unity.....	202
Morning Breaks, The.—John Oxenham	230
Nature and Extent of Unity—Rev. Edward Scribner Ames, Ph.D.	324
New Roman Catholic Move, A. The Christian World.....	365
New England Conference on Christian Unity—Ralph W. Brown.....	260
Next Steps—Rev. William Adams Brown, D.D.....	15
Noyes, Alfred. Dreams	315

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XVIII

373

	PAGE
Ohio's Christian Unity Program for 1930—Vinton E. McVicker.....	342
Ohio Christian News, The. Interdenominational Communion Service in Ohio	60
Opie Explains, Dr. Thomas F.	45
Opinions on the Findings of the Baltimore Conference— Angell, President James R.—Boughton, Former President Fred G.—Binford, President Raymond—Coe, Principal Curtis E.— Cowling, President Donald J.—Clark, Chancellor L. C.—Cутten, President George B.—Currie, President Thomas W.—Clarke, Editor Jas. E.—Creitz, President Charles E.—Clippinger, President W. G. —Davis, President Boothe C.—Davis, President Ozora S.—Dexter, President Walter F.—Denison, Secretary Warren H.—Dennett, Editor Edward P.—Evans, President Milton G.—Edwards, Dean G. D.—Eiselen, President Frederick Carl—Evans, President Silas— Erdman, Professor Charles R.—Freeman, President Harlan L.— Faunce, President W. H. P.—Gray, President A. F.—Groom, Rev. F. H.—Harmon, President A. D.—Hoben, President Allan—Holt, President Hamilton—Hunt, President Emory W.—Horn, Rev. Wil- liam M.—Jacobs, President Edwin E.—Jordon, Rev. O. F.— Kershner, Professor Frederick D.—Knudson, Dean Albert C.— Kelso, President James A.—King, President Wm. West—Kratz, Dean A. Roger—Lipsey, Editor P. I.—Locher, Chairman C. W.— Mathews, Dean Shailer—Mackenzie, President W. Douglas— Mendenhall, President W. O.—Minton, Secretary W. P.—Mosiman, President S. K.—Main, Dean Arthur E.—Morgan, President J. H. —Mock, President C. A.—McClure, President James G. K.—Moody, President Paul D.—Nash, President G. W.—Parsons, President Edward S.—Penny, President Mark E.—Peck, Headmaster Ralph E.—Quillian, President Wm. F.—Rall, President E. E.—Scott, President Walter Dill—Swetland, Headmaster R. W.—Sheatsley, Editor J.—Smith, President Charles J.—Snavely, President Guy E. —Ullom, President John T.—Voigt, Professor A. G.—Washburn, Dean Henry B.—Wearing, Dean Thomas.....	64-91
Outlook for Christian Unity, The—Rev. Karl Reiland, D.D.....	290
Oxenham, John. The Morning Breaks.....	230
Pacific Churchman, The. Bishop Temple Makes Bold Proposals.....	165
Parsons, Rt. Rev. Edward L. The Appeal Must be to Christ.....	264
Pastoral Letter of the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, The	246
Peabody, D.D., Rev. Francis G. Unity by the Way of Spiritual Loyalty	154
Proposed Union of the Christian and Congregational Churches, The— Rev. F. G. Coffin, D.D.....	119
Proposed Union of the Christian and Congregational Churches, The— Rev. Charles Emerson Burton, D.D.....	121
Prayer for Unity, A—Nicolaus L. von Zinzendorf.....	27
Problems of Our Coöperative Work—Rev. Madison A. Hart.....	236
Protest Against Intercommunion, A—Rev. B. Talbot Rogers, D.D.....	228
Progress in Church Union in South India—Rev. John J. Banninga, D.D.	128
Progress Toward Religious Unity—Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, D.D.....	316
Protestant High Churchmanship—Rev. Robert A. Ashworth, D.D.....	207

	PAGE
Protestantism in Virginia Reveals Debts Owed Both to Catholic and to Jew—Rev. Beverley D. Tucker, Jr., D.D.....	354
Protestant Church Women Looking Toward Unity—Mrs. Josephine M. Stearns	256
Protestant Episcopal Church and Christian Reunion, The—Rev. Beverley D. Tucker, Jr., D.D.	28
Randall, Oscar Jacob. The Rationale of the Community Church.....	212
Rationale of the Community Church, The—Oscar Jacob Randall.....	212
Reiland, D.D., Rev. Karl. The Outlook for Christian Unity.....	290
Restudy of Church Union, A. Bishop William M. Bell, D.D., LL.D....	231
Rogers, D.D., Rev. B. Talbot. A Protest Against Intercommunion....	228
San Francisco Conference, The—Rev. B. D. Weigle.....	150
Should Churches Unite—Now?—Rev. Arthur Judson Brown, D.D.....	139
Shall We Try to Save Denominationalism?—The Community Churchman	363
Singha, Shoran S. As an Indian Y.M.C.A. Worker Sees It.....	164
Smith, Rev. Fred. From Lausanne to Main Street.....	134
Significance of the Italo-Vatican Concordat for Christian Unity, The—Rev. Frederick Lynch, D.D.....	298
Tendency to Ape Rome, The—The Baptist.....	58
Temple Makes Bold Proposals, Bishop—The Pacific Churchman.....	165
Times, The London. As a Modernist Sees It.....	158
There Was a Man—David Starr Jordan.....	219
Tucker, Jr., D.D., Rev. Beverley D. The Protestant Episcopal Church and Christian Reunion.....	28
Tucker, Jr., D.D., Rev. Beverley D. Christian Unity and the General Convention	194
Tucker, Jr., D.D., Rev. Beverley D. Protestantism in Virginia Reveals Debts Owed Both to Catholic and to Jew.....	354
Turk, D.D., Rev. Morris H. Approaches to Unity.....	304
Two-Seed-in-the-Spirit—The Herald of Gospel Liberty.....	263
Unity by the Way of Spiritual Loyalty—Rev. Francis G. Peabody, D.D.	154
Union Church at Iowa State Teachers College—O. D. Foster.....	167
Unity From Within—Bishop of Winchester.....	263
Union of the Evangelical, Reformed, and United Brethren Churches, —The Evangelical Herald.....	364
Unity of Methodists and Presbyterians—Dr. Ray Allen.....	360
Walker, Gertrude B. The Indwelling Spirit.....	336
Weigle, Rev. B. D. The San Francisco Conference.....	150
What Earthly Good are the Denominations?—Rev. Burris A. Jenkins, D.D.	356
Winchester, Bishop of. Unity From Within.....	263
Zinzendorf, Nicolaus L. von. A Prayer for Unity.....	27

BOOKS REVIEWED

	PAGE
Affirmative Religion—Garrison	267
Are Tere Too Many Churches in our Town?	271
Baptismal Regeneration—Murphy	175
Boston—Sinclair	368
Catholic Life, The	367
Christian Unity—Slosser	366
Christianity, Past and Present—Guignebert	268
Christianity and the Present Moral Unrest	368
Conversations at Malines, The	173
Divine Revolution, The—Peck	368
Eternal Spirit in the Daily Rounds, The—Doan	174
Faith and Order—Bate	92
Foundations of Nutrition, The—Rose	176
Guide for the Perplexed, The—Maimonides	270
Heights of Christian Unity, The—Hayes	172
Lausanne 1927—Woods	92
Lausanne—Soper	92
Law or War—Mead	367
Living Church Annual, The	272
Love—Phelps	272
Miss Mayo's Mother India—A Rejoinder—Natarajan	95
New Horizons of the Christian Faith—Grant	272
Our Fathers Faith and Ours—Schaff	95
Peace or War?—Kenworthy	173
Psychological Care of Infant and Child—Watson	176
Religion of Tibet, The—Ellan	176
Religious Education of Alexander Campbell, The—Athearn	271
Son of Mother India Answers, A—Mukerji	95
Story of Philosophy, The—Durant	96
Thinking Toward Christian Unity—Cowden	94
What Is Heresy?—Vizenzinovich	174
Whither Mankind?—Beard	269



PRINTED IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE
HESS PRINTING COMPANY
BALTIMORE, MD.

*A New Book Just from the Press of
Willett, Clark & Colby, Chicago*

"The Scandal of Christianity"

By

PETER AINSLIE

Contents

- I. The Blight of Denominationalism.
 - II. Denominationalism at a Discount in the Eyes of an Intelligent World.
 - III. The Awkwardness of Denominationalism in the Face of Equality of Christians before God.
 - IV. There is No Alternative: Church History Must Be Rewritten.
 - V. The Hurt to Christianity Through Denominational "Voices" — the Denominational School and the Denominational Paper.
 - VI. Can the World be Christianized by a Denominational Christianity?
 - VII. What is the Hope for the Cure of the Scandal?
-

This book is not written to please or to offend, but it is a frank and honest effort to say what multitudes are thinking.

Pages 212

Price \$2.00

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

230 N. FULTON AVENUE

BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.



CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
1928-1929

DATE	ISSUED TO

